3 1 3

THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1891.

I.

KAFTAN'S "BRAUCHEN WIR EIN NEUES DOGMA?"

BY REV. W. M. REILY, PH. D.

"How manifold are the religious standpoints and attitudes towards Christianity, and how varied are the forms of the Christian life! In Christian doctrine as well as life, new formations arise of which hitherto nothing was known. Hence may the judgment often waver, and an unevenness and unsteadiness on its part show itself, but frequently also only an apparent one: for often, naturally under such circumstances, in connection with the strictest Christian confessionalism must the apparently loosest views find place. Under such circumstances the Christian knows not how to judge in regard to the man. The latter presents himself in such a way, that he is at once attracted and repelled by him. For the sake of the difference, to deny the affinity is not in his power; nor for the sake of the affinity, the difference. Here one cannot drive straight ahead with a bare Shibboleth, by which each individual is recognized and has his place assigned him, whilst we regard only the outward form and the letter, paying no attention to the spirit, as our North American brethren, in their extremely innocent (*unbefangen*) way, are wont to do."—Richard Rothe, Pastorale, vol. I. p. 59.

"The Human Christ is for men the only medium of knowing or approaching the one only true God. The maddest of all insane dreams under heaven is

that of a theology or science of God, outside of His Son, Jesus Christ. All these biblical Christologies are entitled to respect. They are significant voices in the wilderness of our nineteenth century, harbingering the long-expected new advent of our Lord, and calling upon men to prepare His way and make His paths straight."—Dr. Nevin, "Review," 1882, p. 9.

Dr. Kaftan is the successor of Dr. Dorner in the chair of Systematic Theology of the University of Berlin. A deliverance from one occupying so high a position on the subject treated in the pamphlet under consideration, properly claims the attention of every one interested in current theological literature. The readers of this "Review" in particular, and especially the older ones, will not regret a closer acquaintanceship with the author and his position. Whilst they will be gratified to find here many of those elements of Christian truth which it seemed to be the peculiar mission of this periodical to emphasize and inculcate, they will be startled on finding the author repudiating and antagonizing what always seemed to them vital and essential principles of our holy religion.

To say that we opened the book with many misgivings, is to say but little. We had conceived a decided prejudice against the writer. We had gotten the impression that he was a cold and heartless rationalist. A chilly fear stole over us lest we might be doing worse than wasting the time devoted to him. There was reason for this, for as he tells us himself, hints had been thrown out that he was bordering on atheism. One critic had gone so far as to ask him, what would be the title of the book in which he would advocate the doing away with Christianity?

The production originally appeared in the *Christliche Welt*. Afterwards it passed through three editions in separate form. It is not necessary to say that it is scholarly, logical and profound. The style is lucid, incisive and characterized by many rhetorical graces. Behind the learning, the logic and the style, the reader soon finds the man. And what kind of a man? A flippant caviler? Anything but that. A man of sincerity and earnestness—one might say an enthusiast. He breathes his enthusiasm into his book. The reader lays it down, and

from whatever quarter the caveats may come, he cannot help but say of the science of Christian theology as Galileo did of the earth, "it still does move."

Upon the mind of the average American theologian the question itself makes an unfavorable impression. It smacks of a decided negativism. No one, it would seem, could make the inquiry who was not imbued with the thinking of a Spencer, a Shopenhauer or some other influential foe of the received doctrines of the Christian church. It is a virtual confession on the part of the interrogator that he has never learned to make proper account of history, and that the fact that the Spirit of God has been and is still leading His church to the knowledge of all truth is something foreign to his mind. Further, that those who hold to the old dogma as he calls it, that is the so-called scientific statement of doctrinal truths as professed by orthodox Christians generally, are laboring under a harmful delusion. And still again that he himself feels himself competent to formulate a body of entirely new statements conformable to the actual state of the case.

So far from this being so, he professes the fullest faith in history as a divine force in the world. Especially in the history of the Christian church, he believes that God lives and moves by His enlightning and purifying presence and power. And he must be a shrewd hypocrite indeed if he is not possessed of what the Germans are accustomed to laud as an *echt historischer Sinn.* On page 45 he asserts that no man lives who makes more account of historical growth (*Werden*) in the spiritual sphere than himself. He retorts upon his orthodox opponents and on the same page declares, upon what he considers ground of conclusive proof that, their profession of faith in "God's moving and working in His church on earth is a lame affair." On page 49 he adds: "Of a truth we keep our eyes open; we strive to scan the whole of history and to learn from it; we believe firmly that God's Spirit lives in and controls it, and His purpose is, in and by it, to tell and teach us somewhat. But not in spite of this, rather exactly on this

account do we say: our Protestant church needs a *new dogma.*" On page 47 he explains himself thus: "God's Spirit has so guided the development of the church, that Christianity has unfolded itself in great successive stages, and among these, Protestant Christianity is the highest, as it corresponds again with the historical import of the original Gospel. The entire history of the church is *our* past, and in no period has the divine guidance been wanting. But the case is not such that the products of one period could pass over into another unchanged and remain perpetually valid. This holds good as regards the dogmas, as well as cultus and practical life. Accordingly what history teaches and what faith in God's gracious providence in the church requires, is not to say that the old dogma must remain intact, rather, that we need a new dogma."

So far from condemning the old orthodoxy in the sense of the modern free-thinker, his position is the direct opposite of this. To set up a new truth, as did the prophets and apostles, is something foreign to his mind. From that truth, new to the word then, but old to us now, God forbid that he should take anything or that he should add anything. To formulate anew, is not to repudiate. St. Paul deprecated the making void of the law. As the apostle who above all others made account of the "glorious liberty of the children of God," he sought not the abrogation of the law, but its establishment. So our author with orthodoxy. He professes the highest respect for all who adhere to it in the true sense of it, those, namely, whose souls have been taken possession of by the "ideal of the fathers, the ideal of the pure faith, that of believing and implicit *obedience to God's word.*" "And for this reason," he says on page 14, "we say confidently (*getrost*) we do not antagonize orthodoxy nor do we lay it aside; we would confirm it, we would have its ideal right hold and prevail." We are aware what many are prepared to say about professions of this kind. It is true it is not the dialect of a free-thinker, but it sounds much like the talk of the whole fraternity of modern Protestant sects. They

all want to finish the work which the Reformers began. But allow Dr. Kaftan to explain himself a little further. He tells us that early in his theological life he was confronted with a question, which took the deepest hold upon his thought, and which ever since has been a ruling factor in his theological and religious life. It was not until he had worked himself into the clear on the subject that he ventured upon authorship, and felt called upon to urge others—"*allen und niemandem, dem grossen Publikum*"—to lay to heart certain thoughts about the connection of Christian things, and about what is of advantage to the church of the Reformation. He owns frankly, further, that he got it from a Roman Catholic source. People may charge him with Catholicizing tendencies, and with considerable show of reason. For whilst Roman Catholics continue to make vast and vital account of the principle, among Protestants, it has gone entirely out of fashion. But does that charge disturb him? The very reverse of it! Referring to the writer to whom he is so much indebted, he says on page 12, "When an earnest Christian of that church—and we are proud, as Protestants, that we need not deny Christianity to Roman Catholics as such; it is a refreshment and a joy to find in a man like Möhler something of the *one* truth and of the *one* Lord of all Christendom; yes, when such a Catholic Christian speaks for the cause of his church it is not unusual for Christian thoughts and ideals to lie back of what he has to say." The great question had agitated his own soul, what is truth? Only after he had sat at the feet of Möhler, did the fact properly dawn upon him that the truth is not something that we get, but that gets us, not something that we master, but that is independent of us and greater than we. How are we to be brought to it? By intellectual activity, whether of an analytical, dialectic, intuitional or any other kind, if there be one? Nothing of this. The method is none other than the pure and simple one, the original one of the Gospel itself, and the one practiced by every true Christian since the days of the apostles until the present time. St. Paul calls it the "*obedience of faith.*" But what

has St. Paul to do with Möhler? Möhler has a great deal to say about the *authority* to which faith must render obedience, and throws some light upon the relation of obedience to true liberty. Now we have no time here to present in detail the views of Dr. Kaftan on this vital and fundamental problem of the science of revealed religion; nor is it necessary to do so. They are substantially those which have been set forth in the pages of this Review from the beginning, which have given, perhaps, more than any other, specific character to the theological position it represents, and which were never made account of, more vigorously and with more practical effect than in what we may call the dying utterances of that great champion of them who, forty years ago, entered the lists for their vindication and found a foeman worthy of his steel in the person of the distinguished New England convert to Romanism, Orestes A. Brownson. Well may Dr. Kaftan lament that in modern Protestantism the great principle of obedience to properly constituted authority has *verstummt*. To our mind there is no lesson that orthodox Christians of the nineteenth century should more deeply lay to heart than that contained in the following statements, found on page 13 of the pamphlet before us: "There is a two-fold obedience, of which one leads into freedom, the other ends in slavery. The former is that which deserves the name. And this is the portion of us Protestants since Luther gave us the Gospel anew, and emancipated its liberating forces. If only we could remain conscious of the fact that, freedom takes its rise from *obedience*. This holds not alone in the ethical sphere. It holds of Christianity as a whole, for this latter is a totality, unseparated religion and morality. It holds also of faith. Only on Protestant soil, only in the Church of the Reformation, does that obedience of faith which Paul had in mind become an unadulterated reality. It will become such to the greatest extent when once the activity of, and agencies employed by, the Church lead on to this obedience. Then will evangelical Protestantism develop a hitherto undreamed of power in all lands and among all nations. Then

will it be a well-rounded and self-consistent whole, the pure receptacle of the Gospel and the fountain of divine and spiritual blessedness for mankind."

We have now seen that Dr. Kaftan makes full and intelligent earnest with the claims of history. We have seen, further, that he tries hard to get at the true sense and spirit of orthodoxy, and that he has the highest respect for what he conceives it essentially to be. Still he insists upon it that we need a new dogma. And by the way he ridicules and deprecates the idea of an undogmatic Christianity as much as any one. The statement must be definite and distinct, and in all respects must meet the requirements of a dogma. Now we would naturally infer that he presumes that he is competent to draw up a new formula of this kind calculated to meet the wants of the Christianity of the present day. O that our modern sectarians had some of the modesty of this decried Berlin professor! And it would not be harmful to many of our creed-revisionists, especially those who would undertake to tinker at the most venerable of them, the *symbolum apostolicum*. He tells us on page four, that no man can *make* the dogma that is needed, nor any dogma that is worthy of the name. He thinks that it would not be far out of the way to say that if that man lived, as he does not live, who could lay the dogma finished on one's table, it would be of no use to us. "It cannot be made by this or that one. In the on-goings of history it must force itself upon us, as something which the moment demands and can never be forgotten, as is wont to be the case when the Lord God creates anything in His church on earth." What, then, does he mean, and at what is he aiming? One thing is to direct attention to, and bring the reader to realize, the fact that no *man* can make the dogmas. It is a fact certainly that means much. To hear some of our modern theological sages talk, is to infer that had they been at the elbow of the man who wrote *the* creed, a few suggestions might have been made which, if adopted, would have rendered it a symbol acceptable to all right-minded men to the end of time. One of the things

that Dr. Kaftan aims at is to get such nonsense entirely out of his readers' heads. What he has in view in addition to this he tells us in the following language, on page five: "All historical growth is the result of individual attempts and efforts. These can in no wise be dispensed with. They are and must be presupposed when in a given situation, in consequence of the necessitation which is involved in it, something new arises and finds place. As an individual we allow ourselves some concern and give ourselves some trouble about a matter of great significance and weight, and in this sense must be taken all that is here said about 'the new dogma.'"

Now the question must arise in the minds of many, *Cui bono.* They are ready to say to Dr. Kaftan: You disclaim any desire to disturb the old orthodoxy; you concede that everything essential is there; and yet, how can anything but agitation, doubt and confusion arise from the course you are pursuing? The smooth and peaceful current of evangelical Christianity can only become troubled and beclouded by your pedantic investigations, speculations and beating about for improvements upon what is old, tried and commonly accepted. You theological professors seem to think that the Christian public, like the Athenians in the days of the Apostle Paul, is constantly on the lookout for something new, and deem it your chief business to entertain it with some startling invention or discovery. Why not stick to your legitimate work as teachers of the Church, that, namely, of setting forth the plain old truths of the Gospel, which during these long centuries have proved themselves efficacious for the salvation of souls? Dr. Kaftan would reply to such: Your interrogations are precisely to the point; your point of view is identical with my own; you represent that sensible class of church-members constituting the great majority of them whose deeply-felt wants precisely I am anxious to have met; and I would be ashamed to find myself in the number of the impractical and unhelpful professors to whom in terms of stricture so proper you refer. On page 28 we find the following, which might cause us to suspect that he

had been taking lessons from some theological lecturer in Iowa or Kansas and had caught the spirit of our trans-Mississippi advancement: "We want to say to the corporation (*zünftigen*) professors: Soar aloft into the airy regions of speculation, grasp the shadows, form them into combinations, untie the knots, and begin the play anew. That may be a fine employment for thought on the part of those who can spare the time and pay the cost. But for the church, her ministers, and the service to be rendered to the people, all that is labor lost. For our part, we are a plain folk; we should like to serve the church; we have gotten an idea, which will not let us go, that the concern of the church is the salvation of men, and that to minister to this end is the highest dignity of our theological labor. Hence we do not go out airing ourselves, and investigate questions which nobody can answer, and discuss problems which nobody can solve; for, *we have something to do.* A practical profitable task has been committed to us. . . . Our aim is to bring the truth of God to the people; to awaken faith, that men may be born anew." Sooner accomplish something in this direction "than to have written ten volumes of theological speculation, which to-day gratify clever readers, but after a generation, at most, moulder away in the cool shades of the library."

Of the four chapters of the brochure the second is entitled, "*Hid with Christ in God.*" Orthodoxy has its truth and its right. In so far as it has these, it must be respected and defended. But one of its errors has been to overlook the truth and right of pietism and mysticism, two most important elements in the development of the history of Christian life and thought. In this second chapter he shows how justice must be done to these. It will be necessary for us to translate somewhat at large in order more fully to comprehend the aim Dr. Kaftan has in view. At the same time we will become better acquainted with the method by which he would accomplish it, and also with the man.

"The Apostle Paul never grows weary of inculcating the

fact that whoever has become a Christian is dead to this world, that he belongs to Heaven, that he is entirely a new creature. And in his mouth this is no metaphor. The words, 'As it were' and 'to a certain extent,' are not found in his vocabulary. At least, not where he speaks of things so great, the most important in heaven and on earth. He is certain that, according to our Lord's word, where the treasure is, there the heart must have its home. And he knows no otherwise than that the heart is the man, himself entirely. But the Christian treasure is the Lord Jesus Christ, whom God raised up from the dead and crowned with heavenly glory. Faith unites us to Him more firmly than the ties of blood. Whosoever believes on Him is incorporated into His body and has part in His life. It is not a relation like that between two human beings, though it were the closest and inmost. It is still more close and inner. It is a oneness like that of body and soul, the head and the members. The one Christ, the one Seed of Abraham, to whom the eternal inheritance belongs (Gal. 3: 15–29), it is the *Gesammt-Christus*, of which He is the head and we are the members (1 Cor. 12: 12–13), it is this *Gesammtmensch*, in which all the natural distinctions of mankind disappear, the Church of the Lord, which is of Him and in Him, which may not be separated from Him either in thought or in reality.

"In this connection become intelligible the words at the head of this chapter: 'Hid with Christ in God' (Col. 3: 3). Those who believe on Him are one with Him, and so *they* are where *He* is. But He has returned to God, and awaits the hour appointed for His return. Then will He become manifest, appear in the visible world of perceptible reality. Till then He is hidden, hidden in God. And hidden with Him are those, as to their inner man, who belong to Him, who form the body of Christ, who through Him have become children of the household of heaven and co-heirs of eternal life. Therefore they are dead to this world. Therefore they seek what is above. Therefore they are and remain strangers upon the earth,—those at the same time who prove themselves to be the best citizens

that the earth bears. By this is meant: 'hid with Christ in God.'

"And this is not something that the Apostle announced among and beside other things. It forms the real focus of all his preaching; it is the wealth out of which he lives and works; it is the mark for which he strives, which is ever before his eyes; it is the truth from God around which all his thoughts turn. It can be nothing else but this. Such thoughts cannot be entertained, such words spoken without the consciousnessthat this is our chief concern, yes, around this Heaven and earth revolve.

"Of course, the Apostle Paul preached justification by faith, . . . how I escape condemnation without denying that the law is in earnest and that its judgment is just. Well is it with the man to whom God has granted to draw the right answer to such a question out of the Gospel of Christ. For this is the one great question for every serious man.

"But now comes the other question equally vital: how am I to reach that indestructible life with which my soul is to be sated? I, a child of the dust and born of the earth, how can I without losing the ground from under my feet, be sure of the eternal treasure in an earthly vessel and with certain tread move on, without doubting that all that I do, even the least, may involve gain for eternity? The answer is: *Christ*, the living Christ, to whom all things have been given over, whose the dominion is in heaven and on earth. And this it is now that furnishes to justification and pardon full import and meaning. In so far it is even more essential and significant than justification itself. St. Paul has likewise made great account of the service of righteousness and walking in God's commandments. But he does not proclaim it as a law placed over Christians. No, always in such way that he derives it from the hidden treasure of the heart. Believers are dead to the world; they must regard themselves as such. They have died unto sin, in that they have been planted into His resurrection life; now they are to use their freedom, and bring their members into the service of righteousness. . . .

"The Church has never thought otherwise. That we have been called to eternal life in God, that the goal of our life is beyond, that it has not yet appeared what we shall be, is what it in all periods and centuries has proclaimed. And no less the other fact that it is Christ through whom we gain access, who has atoned our guilt and opened Heaven for us. This has in all ages been the teaching of the Church. But when now the question is asked, '*How is this eternal transcendent possession to be brought into relation to the life of this world?*' then begin the differences. And this question is unavoidable. We live in the world, and in it we are to give heed to our inheritance extending beyond the world; and our laying hold upon it by faith must have consequences for our life here, and must contribute something toward determining the form our earthly life takes on. Here begin the conflicts of opinion and practice; hence the great diverging formations of Christian doctrine and life as they present themselves in the history of the Church.

"The answer of the Roman Catholic Christianity may be indicated by the single word, Monasticism.

* * * * * * *

"Otherwise sounds the doctrine of the Reformation. . . . As Christ commanded His disciples, so here we are called upon to attend to the calling which God has given us, with all that it involves. The duties which belong to marriage and the family, the state and society, are the ones in the fulfilment of which the Kingdom of God as a kingdom of ethical rectitude will come and make itself manifest. In seeking this righteousness, the believer is to show that he has part in Christ, that he is a free man, above all free from himself, and accordingly able to do God's will and not obey his own lusts. . . .

"But now comes the important question, how are we to determine the *equipoise* between our *heavenly possession* by means of which our life is hid with Christ in God, and our *moral duties* which belong to this earthly life?

"Surely it is no superfluous question. It is the same as to ask, what mean the words: 'hid with Christ in God?" Is this

ideal right, this ideal demand of pietism everywhere recognized at present? I do not speak of those, or to those, who live in 'the world,' and desire nothing higher than to enjoy its treasures and its wealth of culture; whose piety, rather 'piousness' limits itself to occasional excitements of feeling of an æsthetic sort. I speak to those who take pride in bearing the name of Christ; but who, possibly to make the approach not too difficult for others, would exclude all narrowness and contractedness from Christianity, and make it appear that one can be a Christian and yet move along with the full current of modern life, recognize and cherish everything that is desirable and attractive and still be an humble follower of Christ. The question is, do not you, and do not we, sometimes go too far with our liberality (*Weltoffenheit*)? Of course I cannot fix the limit and say how far one is to go and how far not; no one can in the wide, wide world. But I would like to have it understood that there is such a limit, a line of demarcation, which is *absolute* and dare not be crossed. At least one, which we cannot cross without committing sin, and so incurring guilt. Here is the limit: hid with Christ in God; hence, how near so ever may be my approach to the things of the world, and intimate my relations with all that the life and culture around me brings with it, there must still be a line of separation between all this and myself, that is my soul, whose rest and peace is in God.

"And this is true of it all without exception. We know that there are no purer or nobler joys than those which bloom in the home and family. But we know too that he is not worthy of Him, who loves all this more than Him; we know what is written about plucking out the eye and cutting off the hand. We love our nation and fatherland. It may count on us in the hour of need; but we forget not that the Son of Man had not where to lay His head. We should taste somewhat of His homelessness. There is a communion which passes for more than all that nation and fatherland means. We thank God daily that He allows us to work and has given us a calling. But we pursue it in freedom, without becoming its slaves. We enjoy

everything beautiful afforded us on our way; but we hold firmly fast to this, that all that is named flesh has but *one* right, and that is to be crucified. We know of little on this earth that stands higher with us than to breathe the crisp, clear air of free, unprejudiced investigation; but we forget not that there is such a thing as truth, and what we mean by truth, human investigation has never reached, and never will.

"But this is all a matter of course. They are principles which all will subscribe to. But I must go a step farther. And here I know not whether all will agree with me; nevertheless I am certain that what I state is a fact.

"Even moral obligation and its performance belongs to this world. It does not, with its earthly contents reach into the inner sanctuary. This we must forget and be able to say with the Apostle: 'Let no man trouble me, for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.' Consequently all this is but a means, and must lose itself in the aimed at end. I come out right when I am glad for the goal, and my soul rejoices in its life, hidden with Christ in God. Hence arises the energy and independence with which the Christian goes his way, the firm hand which he knows how to apply, the child-like ingenuousness with which he strives to do his Father's will, with no self-commending, or self-righteous thought. . . .

"But the question is not answered concerning the equipoise between the inner possession which saves us from the world, and the moral duties of which this earthly life is the stage of action. There is danger here of a two-fold mistake. One is to forget our high calling. The other is to follow a self-framed ideal of holiness. The Romanists find it in Monasticism. Pietism sets up its *own* ideals, and its errors are apparent on every hand.

"And here I have not particularly in mind, what is designated as the puritanical scrupulousness and narrowness of pietism. I myself am too good a pietist not to see that this tendency—although often enough carried too far, has *per se* its own good right. I know from my own experience that in the

business of following the heavenly Master, one becomes very indifferent toward much that in the modern world is deemed of vast significance and praised as part and parcel of the lofty interest of culture. Is that hostility to culture? If so we come under the category of foes to culture. But before you censure, forget not that the Master and His Apostles made little account of culture. With all your skill, you can never explain away this feature from the Gospel. And if you mix the leaven with all kinds of meal—tell me, what will you have left for the class of people, who, after they have grown weary of culture, seek the salvation of their souls, which the Master, also their Master, has entrusted to the hands of us, His servants? And I know this: that much that is good in itself carries with it concealed dangers for many. I know that it is exceedingly easy to say: my conscience allows this or that, and I cannot see any harm in it; but that it is exceedingly difficult to restore that soul which has gradually turned from the wholesome nourishment of the Father's house to the husks which the swine do eat. Accordingly this pietistic vigor is not so bad a thing after all. I am ready to praise only that *Weltoffenheit* which knows at the proper time to change itself into world-abnegation.

"But perhaps some one will say, 'You make the matter too difficult, you hedge in the way on this side and on that too closely, whilst, as all know, the Gospel and faith in it is a simple thing.' To this a three-fold answer.

"The first is: you are right, it is a simple thing for him, however, into whose heart it has come, and who has made the great resolve to be nothing, absolutely nothing on the earth but a Christian and a servant of our heavenly Master. But how for those who may be doubting and still inquiring? Everyone knows that the simplest things are the most difficult of explanation.

"Secondly, shun the error that faith, that Christianity comes of itself without prescript! It is not a natural fruit of the so-called good heart. It is a work of the divine Spirit in man, and

on man's part is required *obedience*. This we have already seen. Now it is clear of how much importance it is. Here we are concerned about the obedience of faith. And just as certain as it is that a free and joyful obedience must be the result, so certain is it that, as in the case with all obedience, it must start with exercise and discipline. That man whose eyes God has opened to the glory of Christ, will cheerfully place himself under His banner and discipline, to learn what it is to become a new creature, namely, a heavenly one, which is born of God. But under no circumstances does Christianity grow spontaneously forth from the inclination of the heart. Obedience is indispensable.

"Thirdly, it is the business of the Church to point out to us this way of inner discipline and exercise. The wealth of doctrine which she furnishes us by the way, the bread of life which she breaks for us, must serve this purpose. It is her *dogma* that is to capacitate her for this. And if the dogma of the Church does not suffice for this, then it is plain, we need a 'new dogma.'

"Or, will you say, in all that has been said, the question of the dogma has not been touched; only practical inferences, the drawing of which is left in each one's hands. I answer: in all this nothing but the dogma has been in mind, or, if you choose, the doctrine of Christ, namely, how we are to understand His supermundane, but still living and present glory; then, in what sense we have part in Him and His life; then how, back of all this, lies the fixed and ineffaceable features of the historical Christ-figure; and, once more, how He is to manifest Himself in us His members. What we have in mind thus is the evangelical dogma of Christ, as it grows forth from the inmost life of the New Testament, whose rich contents we should learn to fix in definite doctrinal statements. . . . Only, the doctrine must be such that by it faith is confronted with the truth in its chastening and saving power. The old dogma does not this, not even attempts it. So we need a new dogma. . . .

"To be still more definite, we need new *formulas*. We have the truth. For we have Christ and the Word which testifies

of Him. We know also, for Luther has taught, what the attitude is which we are to assume toward Him. It is that of those who *believe*. But the formulas are wanting which so present the truth that it may awaken faith and become a productive power in each individual. These formulas constitute the 'new dogma' I have in mind. The old dogma may for the time being remain intact. No one shall be harmed who attaches importance to it. What is demanded is that *our* dogma, that namely of the Church of the Reformation, bear upon *the* truths which for us and our faith are life-questions, and not merely with presuppositions and possibilities. And what is further demanded is that we stand firmly and unitedly, on both feet, in the bosom of this truth presented to our faith. Then may we go after the presuppositions and seek to form into logical conceptions the eternal mysteries of God, as the old dogma does. But they *are* still presuppositions. But in no case must the reverse course be pursued, that namely, of making the presuppositions of greater account, and the consequences of less. For then would our evangelical faith remain without discipline. Then what is essential and vital hangs in the uncertainty of being gathered from the Scriptures as each one is able. Thus wrangling about the dogma would never come to an end. Accordingly, we need formulas for the truth which has been given us. . . .

"Therefore, we will assiduously discharge our duty, without looking to the right or the left. The question is not whether or not we shall be scorned or reviled. The question is, *Was frommt?* *Was frommt* is that the obedience of faith be established among all nations, and that the Church unite men in the life hid with Christ in God. *Was frommt* is that we do what we can to compass this end better than hitherto. Involved in this is, that we fix in definite formulas the truth, on that side of it which is turned toward our faith, *i. e.* that we seek the 'new dogma."

It is evident, of course, that the dogma is not to be new in the absolute sense of the word. This would involve a new

faith, a new church. The movement toward it must be in a line with the Reformation. What must be aimed at is to carry forward the Reformation idea to its full realization. In the third chapter of the brochure Dr. Kaftan explains what he means by this.

The formal principle of Protestantism comes first. Great stress is laid upon the fact that the science of exegesis is ever changing and growing, and that our acquaintance with the Bible is becoming more accurate. Here is a phenomenon which is not a trifle in the economy of theology; it is a matter of most momentous significance. Dr. Kaftan asserts that he knows of no Protestant theologian who would approve or follow the hermeneutical methods adopted by the old orthodox teachers. If there were one, he would not be listened to. That their conception of scripture interpretation was wrong, is patent to all. If we cannot approve of their methods, we cannot accept the result of their application. Our faith will not suffer it; our evangelical fidelity to the Bible would be belittled. This faith and this fidelity point out a different way. "The exclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures in matters of faith, a fundamental principle of our Church, demands that the formulas of doctrine do not ignore the better acquaintance with the Bible which to-day we possess."

Next comes the material principle. Faith, since the Reformation, means a different thing from what it did in the old Church. Then it was a holding for truth, an intellectual act; now it is an assured confidence, a matter of the heart and will. "Faith is everything, entire Christianity, includes all." "To believe, which no one can unless he is led to it by God's word and Spirit, means to enter into a new relation to God and thus to become possessed of a new, a world-overcoming power." "We understand the task assigned us to be, to insist upon and adhere to the stand-point of faith in all our teaching. No sentence shall occur in the way of doctrinal statement which does not make intelligible the truth given us of God in its relation to the inner man, to personal faith and life; no sentence

of which we cannot say, teach and prove, that it must be appropriated in faith, and if not so appropriated, it can never become your own. Not until this has been accomplished can it be said the task of doctrine-building set up by the Reformation has reached its completion. But once so far, we shall have in such doctrine *Our* dogma, that namely of the Church of the Reformation, *i. e.*, in comparison with the old, a 'new dogma,' another formulation of the truth presented to faith."

Lastly, under this head the practical effects of the Reformation. In two respects it consisted in no mere gradual modification of a legitimate situation. It involved a break, a new order of things. Prior to it, all centered in a hierarchy; at least the hierarchy was the bed in which the main current of Christian life and thought flowed. Now we find the proper body of Christianity in the communion of believing people, the sole head of which is their invisible Lord. The other feature in which there has been no development, but a break with the past, is that of cultus and the Church's training and guidance of the individual believer. We know of no monastic discipline nor auricular confession. Ours is the task by means of God's word to educate to, and maintain in, faith. We know of no sacrificial service performed by the priest for the benefit of the laity. Protestant Christian assemblies for mutual edification and for the reception of blessings from Him who has given us all things in Christ.

But how now about respect for history, at least so far as doctrine is concerned? Dr. Kaftan answers: "History teaches *me*, that the great forms of human life and thought, whose sway holds through the centuries, are a unit, a totality, in which the single parts inwardly condition and correspond to one another. Roman Catholicism is one of these inwardly agreeing forms. The old dogma grew up in this connection and enters as an essential part of the organism. If we of the Reformation have broken with this form of Christianity in essential particulars, the consequence must be that we cannot long hold to the Roman Catholic dogma. We need a dogma which in the same way is an essential part of evangelical Christianity."

Still again, how about faith in the guiding presence of God's Spirit in His church on earth? To this he replies "Does anyone believe that this divine guidance limits itself to doctrine and does not at least allow it to be seriously harmed, but in other respects gives free play to human error and sin? . . . Don't stand in a purely theoretical way with one foot in the Roman Catholic view of history. Take in the whole and say with me, God's Spirit has so led the development of the church, that Christianity has found expression in great successive stages, and evangelical Christianity is the highest of these stages, in as much as it harmonizes with the historical sense of the original Gospel."

Then summarily on the subject of the Reformation, we have the following paragraph: "We need a new dogma, because evangelical Christianity is a totality of its own kind, and because the break with the past, out of which it has grown, necessarily carries its consequences into the sphere of doctrine. It is no fiction that here an inner connection exists. It is a reality of daily experience. We have no mass nor confessional. Instead of this we have the Word and our faith, *i. e.* we have the living present Christ, our High Priest, in whom and by whose power we live, we have our conscience firmly anchored in God's word, a fountain and security of that courageous freedom which belongs to the Christians. So we go our way, so we do our work, and discharge the duties of our calling, not by running to mass nor undertaking pilgrimages.

"We commune with Him who is ever present, we pray to Him, whilst surrounded by our fellow-men, from whom we ask no favors, because we have all in God, and can do nothing better than serve all in the spirit of love; accordingly we are prepared daily to crucify the flesh and to overcome the evil which is ever found in the natural heart. Yes but—if so, we must have *one truth*, a truth which supports us, on which we live, through which we are what we are. Here the old dogma does not answer the purpose. For this purpose it was not intended nor constructed. What we need is a doctrine, a dogma, calculated to set our faith in proper relation to Christ and keep it there;

not the wisdom of the professor's chair, no high speculations for hours of leisure and reflection, but an embodiment of the truth given to us in its relation to faith, and its bearing on faith. And so we say: all one how this individual or that may regard the old dogma, whether skilled speculation about it seems of account to him or not, we need in the church of the Reformation, at any rate, a dogma corresponding to our faith."

The caption of the fourth and last chapter is "What think ye of Christ?" The doctrine concerning Christ is the fundamental dogma of the church. If modification is needed here, it is evidently needed all around. In the Reformation it was left unchanged, but it must be shown that Protestant consistency requires that no doctrine be left untouched, yet he tries to convince us that his own views have no affinity with modern free-thinking. On the contrary they grow forth from the inmost life of the apostolic proclamation, they are in accord with the meaning and intent of the Reformation, and fall in with the needs and requirements of evangelical Christianity.

He regards it as in full accord with the being and attributes of God that He should reveal Himself in the flesh and dwell with men. He further sees no help for our fallen human nature, in its corruption and misery, except through a mediator who is not mere man but God. He writes several edifying pages in enlarging upon the fact that in our Christian faith we have reached the goal of all religion, that we have found God and in Him eternal truth, and that beyond Christ nothing is to be thought of in the way of advancement. He then expresses himself as follows: "We may consider and meditate, but there is no other way; we have no other word and no other testimony, but are forced to say 'My Lord, and My God!' Said we otherwise, we would sin against the truth, we would tear out of our faith, out of our knowledge the jewel without whose brightness all else would be dreary and dead. Nay more, we would destroy the only resting place for our feet, cast aside the consolation of our conscience, and repudiate the power of our life. Hence we confidently say, it is the glory

of our faith which promises and insures the victory for all mankind that we can say to a man 'My Lord and My God!' that all our thoughts about God and divine things, about the origin of being and the goal of all existence, revolve around Him, the man Christ Jesus, our Lord and our head."

But the question, What think ye of Christ? is thus answered in only a general way. When more precision is demanded, the answers vary. Has that only full and right answer been given, into which absolutely no error or shadow of error has entered? Certain it is that there are two ways in which the person of Christ can, nay, must be viewed. And out of this fact, owing to the infirmity of our vision, for we see as through a glass darkly, all our trouble has arisen. Hence, too, as Dr. Kaftan thinks, the necessity of the "new dogma."

We may in trying to understand His divinity, view our Lord as He stands related to Him whom He calls His Father in Heaven, who is ever with Him, who speaks through Him, and whom all see in seeing Him. This relationship is an eternal mystery. The Bible has very little to say about it. The most that men say in regard to it are their own presuppositions. The necessity of caution, as Dr. Kaftan reminds us, is plain when we remember that we who are the children of time can never fathom the connection between time and eternity. This now is the side of the subject into which the investigations of the old Church extensively entered. The historical situation, from within and without, required this. And the work was done as well as the circumstances permitted. Let the ancient teachers have full credit for their zeal, their diligence and their skill. Nor shall any blame be attached to those who prefer to occupy the same ground and adhere to their conclusions.

But Christ stands related to men, and from this point of view His divinity may be regarded. He is our brother, our Saviour, as well as our Lord. In viewing Him on His human side, we are not left to logical demonstrations. We have the plain story of the Gospel, which he who runs may read. We have a filled out historical life picture here, which furnishes us as

complete a conception of the man as we have of any of the world's great characters, of whom history gives us an account. It is to the humanity of Christ, His abiding relation to men, and the work He is continually doing, and will hereafter do for us, that the latter church has been directing its special attention, and thus trying to fathom the contents of its faith in a divine Saviour.

Now comes the question—which of these ways of viewing the person of Christ is to come first, to which the other must be in some sense second and subordinate? The Roman Catholic has no hesitation in answering. He will say, "We, the church, come to you with mysteries. Your first business is to accept these; all that you afterwards learn from the written Gospel as well as all your experiences of its benign influences upon your heart, must be controlled by and fitted into the dogma which we first lay upon your consciences." This position they hold all the way through, and adhere to it with all its logical consequences. For their consistency they deserve more credit than most Protestants will allow. But be it observed that here, faith is a holding for truth and intellectual operation, that and nothing more.

The Protestant Christian says, "My faith strikes me as analogous to that of the first believers. Theirs was awakened by the preaching of Christ, and by the works which He performed. They put confidence in Him, and experienced the blessedness of communion with Him, until they were ready to exclaim, 'My Lord and my God!' So I hear and read the Gospel, I accept its truths, I allow them to exert their power upon my life, so that I am ever ready to make St. Peter's memorable confession; and when I come to die, to say with St. Stephen, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.' This risen and exalted Saviour is my only Lord, and the object not only of my trust, but my adoration; and the image that I form of Him in His state of glory, is that which is furnished me in the Gospel narrative. The more I learn of what He was, of what He taught, and what He did whilst upon the earth, and the more I

come to realize the sanctifying and comforting power of this knowledge in my soul, the more confidently can I, with St. Paul, express my faith in Him, as 'God over all blessed for evermore.'" *

Now Dr. Kaftan thinks that if the same man were asked, "What objection have you to accepting the old doctrine of the church, as this is embodied in the Protestant confessions?" he would probably answer, "None in particular, if you consider all that to be presupposed by the facts already given, only I am not aware that they bear upon my faith in the same sense that that does which awakens it, enters into it, and keeps it alive." Dr. Kaftan thinks, if they do not enter into faith in the Protestant sense of it, they should not enter into the Protestant dogma.

He explains himself more fully thus: "When we profess faith in Christ's divinity, we have in mind the *glorified Christ*, the living present Head of His Church. For faith has not to do with the eternal mysteries of deity, but with the present reality of revelation. But this reality is the Lord, as the glorfied head of all who have become one with Him by faith. When we say to the man Christ Jesus: 'My Lord and my God!' we mean the risen and exalted One, who is in God, by virtue of whose fullness and power, we are the Christians that the grace of God has made us.

"But for this faith, the historical life picture of our Lord as

* Rothe expresses himself similarly in his No. 26 and 27 of his *Entwürfe*. "In the flesh, in the wretched *Stoff* of our earthly human life, we have a revelation of God, of nothing less than God, in the complete and essential sense of the word. But you may not look away from the flesh, from the Christ who appeared in history; it is in the historical Christ that you have the revelation. You may not soar beyond what you there have, and out of your own wit form a more spiritual, supposedly a more exalted Christ (as though, with our own speculation, we could frame one loftier than the historical Christ). But you may not stop with the flesh as such, nor with the historical Christ purely as such; but the historical Christ must serve as a mirror in which is reflected the countenance of God; you must read the heart of God in the human features of Jesus Christ."

presented to us in the Gospel, get an entirely different meaning. I say not too much when I assert that the old dogma does not harmonize with this latter, and that only with difficulty can the discrepancies be smoothed out. And this to-day is a generally acknowledged fact. There is no mentionable orthodox theologian of the present or recent past, who has not felt the necessity of applying here the mending hand, one in one way, another in another. Whether these attempts succeed, whether they can accomplish anything under the old posture of affairs, are questions we do not now attempt to answer. We are at present concerned about the concession thus made, and about the fact that there remains on hand a more or less difficult compromise between two things which do not agree. Let it be remembered: the gospel life-picture of Jesus Christ is without doubt, the most precious inheritance of Christianity. Who can describe what results and what blessings have thence proceeded through all these centuries? And the dogma of Christ is the ground dogma of the Church. But the two do not fit together—they must be forced into some sort of harmony. Is that in order? . . .

"The definite features of Christ's historical life determine the bearing and character of our faith. Here we have not to do with empty fancies, but with the truth according to God's word. We are not called upon to imagine for ourselves a perceptible image of our Lord in His glorification and arbitrarily to select the colors with which we picture forth the character of our soul's intercourse with Him. Everything of this kind is absolutely excluded. We have to make the *spiritual contents* of His glorified divine life intelligible for ourselves by means of His historical life picture. If we transgress this rule, then we turn away from God's word and fall into the bypaths of idle fancies. If, on the contrary, we hold to this rule we have with it a fixed form for the truth vouchsafed to our faith, a guide for our knowledge and a law for our inner life. Here we have a dogma such as faith needs, and with which the Protestant Christian cannot dispense. . . .

"Our faith turns about these two points, the glorified Head of the Church and the historical life of our Lord. It rounds itself out in this, that it asserts and confesses that Jesus Christ is of God. Hereby it gets its energy and herewith it carries out its right really and truthfully, to speak, and to boast of the divinity of the man Jesus. Further it goes not. What is then begun, when attempts are made to make this 'of God' clear and intelligible, is naught but speculation, professors' wisdom, thinking about the faith, but not the faith itself.

"And as with faith so with the dogma, which binds and obligates all. It fixes the contents of faith in definite forms and formulas, suited to bring such faith near to all, to awaken and strengthen it in all, and thereby to bring all into subjection to the divine life-law which is contained in this faith. What goes beyond this belong as little to the dogma, as it is a matter of faith."

But finally Dr. Kaftan goes so far as to assert that the old dogma and Protestant faith not only do not belong inwardly together; rather they oppose and exclude one another. One requires what contradicts the other.

"If the evangelical faith in the divinity of our Lord is to stand, the derived statements regarding the Life of Christ and His being from God must correspond with this faith. If they do not, they do away with (*aufhaben*) the old dogma. Contrariwise, if we are to hold on to the old dogma, we must sanction the consequences for practical piety which correspond to and grow out of *it*. But these sound very differently from what the Protestant faith calls for or prescribes."

To make the first point evident he reiterates what had already been fully set forth. "The attempt to make the theanthropic life of the Lord in the world intelligible must rest absolutely upon the historical life picture of the Gospel. It dare not start out independently of this, and then in a supplementary way be made to harmonize with scriptural facts. It must first of all gather up its material here, and paint with the colors thus afforded. And the last conclusion in regard to our Saviour

being of God must remain in accord with the historical reality furnished us in the Bible."

Upon the second point he enlarges more fully, namely, that the old dogma involves practical consequences entirely different from those which are bound up with our Protestant faith. He selects three of the ruling features of the Christian life of the Eastern Church and shows how they are vitally connected with what he calls the old dogma. Then he passes over to the Western Church, and in the Roman hierarchy, with all that it includes, he sees a similar relationship. After entering into a full discussion of the subject, he arrives at this conclusion: "Chiefly the practical consequences from the old dogma which the Greek and Roman Churches held in common, belong to those features of Catholicism which for us and our faith cannot stand, because we find them to be not only an erroneous form, but a distortion of, Christianity. In rejecting the mythical soul-saving apparatus and the hierarchy erected upon it, we practically and actually reject the old dogma.

"The two do not agree. It is not we that say that this is so, on arbitrary and subjective grounds, not we that say that the Protestant Church needs a new dogma, but the development of history has placed us in such a situation that the old dogma has practically and actually lost its significance for us and our faith, or at least it has significance for it only in so far as it in its way brings to expression the divinity of our Lord. The details are insignificant for us. What we need is fixed formulas for our Protestant faith. These we must seek. In that we do this, and in this sense speak of a new dogma, we are serving the church and the faith it announces. We are obediently following in the wake, so distinctly indicated, of the march of development in the history of Christianity. From the Oriental Church it comes down through the occidental middle ages on to the faith of evangelical Protestantism—that is the living movement in this phase of world-history. And our faith has its seal of the truth in this, that it has for its contents the real, the historical Saviour, and that ours is nothing less than the renewal of the original apostolic faith."

Our readers now understand why Dr. Kaftan takes the position that the present situation of Protestant Christianity imperatively demands a new dogma. The subject is interesting in virtue of its novelty. The views expressed are of vast significance as coming from one who occupies, perhaps, the most influential dogmatic chair in the Protestant Church, the same which had been occupied by Schleiermacher, Twesten and Dorner. After reading this brochure, it becomes plain why he was put there. First of all he is thoroughly Protestant, and we would not be surprised if he fairly represents the main current of the German evangelical religious life and thought of the present generation. Then he is evidently an enthusiast. He seems to be conscious of a mission of central and vital significance and he throws himself into the work with all conceivable intensity of purpose. His ethical zeal, in these days of lax morality, and in a country like Germany, where a puritanical rigorism never found a home, is certainly something that is edifying and refreshing to behold. Who can regard it as being aught but a favorable omen? When, in connection with these qualities, we recall his keen penetration, his dialectic skill, his classical scholarship, with our moderate information, we know of no one with whom to compare him, unless it would be Zwingli himself. His work, or at least that of the school which he represents, is not yet done. We are inclined to think that they will let themselves be heard from for some time to come.

It is not necessary to say that there is room for criticism. But we have no intention of that kind. Our object was simply to furnish our readers with some account of the production before us and better acquaintance with the man. Our work, which would have been more satisfactory if more space were allowed us, is done. But we cannot close without, by way of conclusion, indicating why we supposed that it would be of interest to those who have given attention to what is known as the Mercersburg movement from its incipiency. Perhaps this is unnecessary; as it is altogether likely that many of those

who have followed us have discovered more coincidences, as well as contradictions, than we could describe. We will not call the following a comparative analysis, for it is far from complete. But an attempt at a proximate one may not be without interest.

I.

Dr. Kaftan agrees with three of the distinguishing tenets of the so-called Mercersburg theology.

1. *Historical development.* This used to be stigmatized as a heresy which we had borrowed from the pantheistic philosophy of Hegel. The review regarded the theory not only as resting on the strongest *a priori* grounds, and as confirmed by empirical research, but as a postulate rendered necessary, if the Church is to rise above its present divided state and reach the unity which lies in its idea. At the close of the article on "The Anglican Crisis" four alternatives are mentioned as the only conceivable ones. "The first is a deliberate giving up of the sacramental system altogether, the only proper end of which—short of parting with the Trinity and the Incarnation—is Baptistic independency, the extreme verge of unchurchly orthodoxy. The second is full despair of Protestantism, and reconciliation in form with Rome, as we have it exemplified with thrilling solemnity in the present English secessions. A third way of escape may be sought in the belief or hope of a new miraculous dispensation on the part of God Himself, through some special agency, armed from His presence with fresh apostolical commission and corresponding powers, such as may supersede at once both Romanism and Protestantism as systems that have become historically powerless and dead. Swedenborgianism plants itself on this ground; and it is the ground taken also by Irvingism—a far more respectable and significant birth of modern church life, than many, having no insight into its natural history are disposed to allow; not to speak of the wretched caricature we have of the same tendency in Mormonism, which, also in its own

way, claims to be a revival in full of the otherwise lost gifts and powers of the Apostolic age. A fourth and last resort is offered, the only one, it seems to us, left for the thoughtful, in the idea of historical development." "We have no patience on this ground with that bald Puritanism, which fairly buries the church, for a thousand and more years, in order to bring it to a more striking resurrection in the sixteenth century. As little can we be satisfied with the visions of Emanuel Swedenborg; they proceed throughout on the assumption that the church as it started with the Apostles has run itself out, both as Catholicism and Protestantism, and that the world is to be helped now only by a new revelation appointed to take its place. Irvingism (in the consideration of which are difficulties neither few nor of light account, to meet which properly, is a task which calls for more than common earnestness in any part of the world) involves the same dismal thought, and needs no other condemnation. If it come to a necessary choice between such a view and Romanism, the advantage lies, decidedly on the side of this last. Accordingly as stated in Vol. III. p. 32, "We are shut up to the idea of historical development as the only possible way of escape from the difficulty with which we are met in bringing the present here into comparison with the past." We have quoted enough from Dr. K. to make it evident how much importance he attaches to historical development.

2. *The nature of faith.* Dr. Kaftan not only insists upon it that nothing but a specifically *divine revelation* can form the contents of faith, (page 12), but tells us faith means "that I count myself into this life connection (*Lebenszusammenhang*) which rises beyond all that is called world into God Himself and into the eternal world. It signifies that I know a life which raises me above the world and frees me from it, that by virtue of my faith I am, through Jesus Christ in God, that I live from His strength, and that I may certainly hope, as a member of his body, to have part in His exaltation and God's glory," (p. 57, 58). People may think about their faith, and they will do so. And they will bring with them their own habits of thought.

Hence differences will arise with all the oneness of the Christian faith. "But with all that is (thus *thought* as being) secondary and derived, faith has nothing to do. Its heart-beat is bound up with the enunciation of the living Lord, who is none other than the historical Jesus" (p. 61). "Faith is not contrary to reason, but the completion (Vollendung) of reason, since by uniting us to Christ it makes us one with God." (p. 76).

3. *The difference between modern religious life and that of early Christianity.* Dr. Kaftan emphasizes with as much force as did the REVIEW, years ago, the contrast between the post apostolic Catholicism and Protestantism. Of course the substance of Christianity is at hand in both. What the Review calls its essence, he calls the general (*algemeine*) which is found wherever Christianity (*ueberhaupt*) exists. The object in view on the part of the REVIEW in depicting in such vivid colors the discrepancy between the *forms* of these historical *Gestaetungen*, was to show the necessity on the part of Protesantism of looking backward to gather up and appropriating elements necessary for its own recuperation from diseases which threaten the destruction of the Christian life entirely. Dr. Kaftan lays stress upon these phenomena for a reason the very opposite.

II.

Differences between Dr. Kaftan's teaching and that of the so-called Mercersburg School.

1. *Doctrines of faith must come direct from the Bible.* How explicitly ground opposite to this was taken by the REVIEW from the beginning need not be said. We all know that the idea of a Bible Christianity, and everything like it was stigmatized as narrow-mindedness, deadness, and ignorance of palpable facts. The very fact that so much thinking (rather no-thinking) of this kind prevailed, was regarded as one of the typical symptoms of the unchurchly spirit of the day. But Dr. Kaftan asserts that "nothing can be counted a dogma but what can be derived (geschöpft) from the rich living fullness of the Scriptures, directly forth from their midst." (p. 35.) "If we settle upon

our dogma in this sense we have the pure doctrine according to God's word, which responds to our faith. In this way we make earnest with the principle that the Word of God alone furnishes us with articles of faith, and nothing but that word, no pope nor angel, no power from earth or heaven." (p. 61.) Let him explain himself more fully. "I know of no Protestant theologian who would approve or adopt the old orthodox teacher's method of using the Scriptures. And if there were one, he would not be listened to. For it is a fact, plain as daylight, that their conception was wrong. To-day we hear that historical development must be regarded; at most, hints of the doctrine of the Trinity are contained in the Old Testament, and more could not be at hand before the completion of revelation, and the appearance of Christ. It seems to be generally conceded that in the New Testament the definite statements of the church doctrine cannot be found, and that later the church reached these only after a long development, which called into requisition the most eminent minds of Christianity for centuries, so that in the New Testament are found outlines and indications of this doctrine, but not the doctrine itself." Now *versus* the greatest dogmatician of Germany, let us hear the greatest living dogmatician of America. (We should beg pardon, perhaps, for the use of these superlatives.) Dr. Shedd in the *New York Observer*, of September 11, 1890, has the following: "The Christian religion contains certain truths that are *so indisputably taught* in the Christian Scriptures, that their acceptance is necessary in order to be a Christian in the sense in which the first disciples were so called at Antioch. They are the doctrines of the Trinity . . . Respecting these there has been little (sic.) disagreement, in ancient, (?) mediæval and modern (?) Christendom. The Christian religion also contains other truths, which both in the Scriptures and in the doctrinal systems, are implications and deductions from these cardinal doctrines." Dr. Kaftan would reply, "There is no use talking, we must allow ourselves to be guided, with our doctrine, our dogma, by God's Word; we can teach no doctrine which finds in Scripture merely

connecting points and suggestions. All that we can do with such doctrinal statements, is to carry them along collaterally as deductions, or as theological speculations, as the good Lord may permit each to indulge in them, but they cannot be held up as dogma, that is as binding and obligating doctrine . . . In short, where the ground dogma is concerned, namely the doctrine of Christ, may God save us from any other than such a doctrine. And what we teach concerning the Holy Trinity, may it be nothing but the sum of Scripture truth, as faith (not a holding for truth as Roman Catholics regard it, but a genuine evangelical assured confidence,) is able to lay hold upon it." (p. 35.)

2. *He throws overboard the traditional dogmatic system.* We have always been inclined to regard the upgrowth of our dogmatic system as we have it for example in its ripest form in Ebrard, Martensen and Dorner, as, in the sphere of Christian thought and intellectual effort, the most valuable fruitage of historical development, and as the standing proof of the truth of the development theory. But says Dr. Kaftan, how absurd to suppose that in the Reformation there should be an absolute break in cultus, discipline and social life from that of the old church, and in the sphere of doctrine alone there should be a steady and unbroken current, with no contradiction here of the past except in what was relatively incidental and unessential! He says that the history of the Evangelical Church of Germany and its dogma, proves the reverse. "Our church made the attempt to fall in with the old dogma, but after centuries of effort it has utterly failed. Development brought it to pass, that the old dogma was rejected, and that during the period of Rationalism, a few fundamental articles of the Christian faith were retained under the name of Rational Christianity. Then came the reaction of Romanticism. The renewal of the faith of the fathers (under the influence of Schleiermacher and the generation following,) led to the rehabilitation of the old dogma. But it did not stand. Scarcely had the joy begun over the final and full reconciliation of faith and science, when the catastrophe came. Strauss chiefly brought it about." The

views of the younger Fichte coincide so closely with the above, that they may be quoted here as he expresses them in his *Seelenfortdaner*, published in 1867, p. xxxvii, *et sq.* After referring to the theological dogmatic system as having gone to decay, and Strauss as having given it its death blow, he adds: "This crisis was a wholesome one; it cleared the atmosphere, and necessitated recourse to the opposite path, the one pointed out by Schleiermacher with such definite precision . . . The specific nature of faith is not a theoretical holding for truth of certain dogmatical or historical statements, just as little an indefinite yearning after the infinite . . . but is a firm confidence (*fides*) in determinate ethico-religious saving truths which are calculated to awaken faith, because they find their eternal confirmation in our heart and will." To men like Dr. Shedd, Kaftan says: "You at times seem to forget that in Protestant Christianity faith has received a sense and meaning it never had before. In consequence of this we have been placed on different stand-points of Christian knowledge from that which produced the old dogma (or dogmatic system.) I know well that you will reply this last is for us a matter of faith in the proper and full sense of the word. You are only too ready with this answer. And I know why. Your thinking on this subject is not logical. You want to unite what cannot be united. You feel bound to the traditions of the old dogma, and yet do not want to give up the standpoint of evangelical faith. In the ardor of your talk you say what you cannot stand by. Rather make full earnest with the evangelical idea of faith, and then will follow with inner necessity an overturning of the order and arrangement of your doctrine. What first of all must be settled and fixed is, what faith apprehends. This must manifestly be the basis and presupposition of all else." (p. 63).

3. *Protestantism has the prerogative of running itself out to its ultimate logical conclusion.* The "REVIEW" will always be known in the history of American theology not merely for its pronounced conservatism, but for the peculiar form of conservatism it represented. It was not satisfied, like old Lutheranism with going

back to the period immediately succeeding that of the Reformation, nor like Anglicanism with a lofty tumble into the bosom of that immediately succeeding the days of the Apostles. The Church of the middle ages and that of Rome are in the same sense parts of the mystical body of Christ as is the Church of the Reformation. It behooves modern Protestantism to look piously back upon the whole movement of Christianity, and to learn lessons of truth and wisdom from Rome itself, lest it forfeit its title to be included in the Holy Catholic Church. Dr. Kaftan seems to take the opposite view. We have renounced the hierarchy with all that is essentially bound up with it. We ask not what the old Church was, nor what it taught. We know what the Reformation was and it devolves upon us Protestants to be true to it, come what may. What could be more emphatic than the following, from page 53: "Protestant Christianity is not simply or in some respects connected with Catholicism, but a totality of its own kind, born out of God's Word and resting upon it. Protestantism, as all are agreed has its mission. How can it fulfil it, unless it be true to itself? Must it not consistently carry out its idea? Must it not completely round out and bring to full light all that is involved in its nature? What its very essence is, is now coming to be known through the diligent, unflinching efforts of men like us. And yet you call us rationalists. We understand perfectly why. It is only the angry cry of despair. And yet you turn around, and in your dying struggles, call upon your arch enemy, human philosophy, a monster with as many tongues as heads, as an auxiliary force to support you in your last life struggles. Beside in turn charging upon you, as the true secret of your misfortune, the same idolatrous reverence for what is ancestral which you ascribe to Romanists, we want to inform you that your doom is sealed, for not without a miracle can that be quickened into life which history has shown to be dead. Come to your senses, therefore, and be brave, consistent Protestants, such as your fathers, of former centuries, would not be ashamed to own. Forward! is our battle-cry. Backward is a

word not found in the Protestant vocabulary. And like Luther, on his way to Rome, carry your Bible under your arm, and with this weapon alone you may rest confident of victory.

III.

Agreement in important particulars with the position taken by the "Review" in what may be called its illuminated period, as distinguished from what has been called its heroic period.

1. *The glorified Christ is the only proper object of the Christian's faith and the centre of all Christian life and thought.*

Here Dr. Kaftan is exceedingly satisfactory and explicit. To I. H. Fichte he would say, "No, sir! With *Heilswahrheiten* the real believer is not content; a *person* can be the only proper object of his faith. Contrary to what you say, further, it must be a historical person, but far more than that, —it must be one who is the *living* embodiment not only of your *Heilswahrheiten*, but of all truth. Now you philosophers have correctly learned from Hegel that God is the truth. It must be that person to whom the Christian believer says, "My Lord and my God!" You seem to have come to a sense of what religious faith involves, and your purely speculative philosophy (and it is certainly a credit to it) has led you in this particular to agreement with all really Protestant theologians. But don't you see that the Christian's glorified Lord is its sole object? The one is the complete counterpart of the other. On page 71 he tells us: "We Protestant Christians derive the certainty of our faith and the power of our life from the proclamation of the living, glorified Christ, who is none other than the historical one." On page 56, "If we start out with the fact that it is the living glorified Lord whose divinity faith immediately (*unmittebar*) acknowledges, we are then in a situation to bring the Gospel life-picture of our Lord into proper arrangement with our faith." By this he seems to mean as he afterwards says, "we can thus make the spiritual contents of His glorified divine life intelligible, through the account we have of Him in the Bible." "Faith has not to do with the

eternal mysteries of Deity, but with the revealed and present reality. This reality is the Lord as the glorified head of all believers" (page 55). "We have in mind the *glorified Lord* (italics his), the living present head of His Church when we confess His divinity" (page 55). "Faith in His divinity is the living heart of all our belief, the real and true centre of all else" (page 53). "We believe in the divinity of our Lord; then we believe in His coming from God (*Ursprung aus Gott*). He was a man, certainly—on this depends our salvation. But He was also *the* man in whom it was the Father's will that mankind should be united with Himself, the divine head of humanity united to God,—on this depends our salvation none the less." In the REVIEW 1883, page 7, we read: "We can never be sure of the real evangelical sense of any Christian doctrine except as our apprehension is determined first of all, and exclusively of all else from the overpowering vision of what the Redeemer is in His own glory," the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. *Such vision* may well serve to unsettle some notions of Christianity, more or less mechanical and sompambulistic, taken from beyond the idea of Christ Himself. The history of the Church is full of that. Whole tomes of theology have been constructed in this way, and still continue to be so constructed. For that very reason, however, they deserve to be shaken and unsettled, that the good and true things in them which cannot be shaken may remain. And this can be only by their coming into new construction, where Christ shall be seen and felt to be, not only one great stone, but the chief corner-stone, the only real foundation-stone of the entire structure." On page 20, of 1882, we read: "In our Christological estimate of the Gospel, viewed in this way from its highest summit in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, we are confronted at once with two great mysteries which enter into the constitution of His person, namely, the mystery of the Holy Trinity and the mystery of His Holy Incarnation. These, it is easy to see, are beyond all natural thought, and belong to a region which is higher than the highest finite intelli-

gence. But it is wrong to think of them being therefore without inward relation to our human rationality, having no force other than blind external authority. . . . Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there, and only there, is liberty. Let us beware then, of turning the high doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation into the dead lumber of outward memory and confession. Do they not meet us everywhere in the Gospel as the cardinal pillars of Christian theology, the underlying forces of the universal Christian life? What must we think of our Christianity, then, if we see in them no practical relation to either, but imagine we have to do with them only as abstractions, which cannot enter our intelligence or will in any way, but resolve themselves into empty words and nothing more?" Then later, "Alas that our common Christianity should be so generally shorn of its strength just here, by not seeking it in the Divine Man Jesus Christ!"

2. *The Bible the only means of reaching Christ.* Dr. Kaftan insists upon it that the Bible alone furnishes what awakens faith and supports it. For here alone we have what can be called revelation, and revelation is for faith, and faith for revelation. Now Christ is the only proper object of faith and so the substance of all revelation. By laying hold of the promises of the Gospel and submitting our will to the requirements of the Gospel we are brought into union with Christ. The "Review," 1883, p. 33, says: "That is the mysterious constitution of God's Holy Word, its miraculous constitution, over against all simple naturalism in the other view, whereby it is fitted to be a real living bond for men between the natural and the supernatural, a veritable ladder of communication between heaven and earth, with the angels of God there ascending and descending in token of the restored harmony of paradise lost by the fall." *

* See "Review," 1873, article on "Christianity and Humanity," a paper read before the Evangelical Alliance, which turns around this point at its centre. The paper seems to have fallen flat at the time, but as facts are brought to light by men like Kaftan, it looms up more and more in its full significance and force.

3. *Something new wanted.* A new era must certainly be at hand. For with an effete dogma and a church impotent to enforce "obedience and faith," necessary to union with Christ, the idea of authority having *verstummt*, no wonder that the cry is for something new. Dr. Kaftan pretends not to know exactly what. God alone can "make" it; man cannot. "We say that if that man lived, as he does not, who could lay it finished upon our table, perhaps it would be of no use to us." Certainly a noble confession. All that we can do, he tells us, is to concern ourselves with mind and heart about it and thus "seek" this something new so imperatively needed. Still he tells us that this something must have one quality. It must be a compulsory power (*Zwang*) which we cannot resist, which overpowers us, which makes us certain that we are not following fancies or the idle inclinations of our will, but that we recognize the truth. Only this compulsion lies in the sphere of freedom. In a word it compels obedience, the obedience of faith. But it has become evident that only a person can compel such "obedience of faith." There is no doubt who that person is. But we have seen that we have communication with Christ solely through His word. Is there, however, no possibility of His coming *anew* through His word so as to compel the obedience of faith in such a way as to correspond with Dr. Kaftan's *Zwang der Thatsachen*, the resultant of which always, but of which alone, is certain knowledge; only, however, when the *Thatsachen* are empirical, it is the knowledge of sense, therefore *without freedom*, but when they are spiritual it is that of faith, therefore *with freedom*. "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet believe." Already in 1873, in the article on the old Catholic movement we have the following: "That the world altogether is in the midst of a crisis of the most extraordinary kind is becoming continually more plain. Never was a great epoch heralded, not simply for the thought but for the very feeling of men, by a more impressive array of prophetic and admonitory signs. The concurrence of outward and inward forces, flowing together from different

sides, in the age of the Reformation, was less striking. The only parallel to it is in what had place at the coming of Christ into the world; and it is not strange that some have been prompted to see in it in this way, the *natural counterpart* of that first advent, the introduction of a new dispensation in fact, drawing with it in the end the full power and glory of His second advent." Before ten years were around the illumination came, for in 1883, pp. 31–42, we have the following, which seems to us to express it as clearly and unmistakably as the same thought could be expressed in any language: "The spirit thus in the word is no other than Christ Himself. He, therefore, is the one universal sense of the word, its inward life and soul. He is not in it partially only, here and there, nor occasionally only, now and then. He is not in it in any secondary view, as the reflection merely of some primary object or system of objects, on the mundane side. He is there as the inmost whole of the entire revelation. *To that we are absolutely shut up by the force of the Christological idea itself.* Other things may be the shadow of Him, He can never be their shadow. What follows from this? The inspiration of the word has nothing to do with its mundane aspects—historical, ritualistic, pictorial or simply scientific in any view—on their own account; but look through these always and wholly to Christ, and the spiritual world in Him, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all. Is He not in His divine humanity the sum total of all revelation? How then can we talk or think of a word of God, revealing the mind and will of God, and not believe Him to be in it as its living principle at every point. Nothing less than that indeed is what He Himself says of His coming into the world, that it was to fulfil all things written concerning Him in the law of Moses and in the prophets and in the Psalms. For most assuredly this fulfiling was not to be of some grains of truth only hid away here and there in bushels of chaff; and then also, perhaps, through such strained constructions of the natural sense as we find applied to the text, '*Out of Egypt have I called My Son*,' and other like examples.

It could be nothing less than the internal spiritual meaning of the law, the Psalms and the prophets, in their wholeness (as this had been in them from the beginning) now emerging from them and disclosing what it had been all along, in His own actual advent as the living Messiah, the only true God manifest in the flesh."

II.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHRISTOLOGICAL PRINCIPLE ON THE DOCTRINES OF GOD, OF MAN, AND OF GRACE.

BY REV. W. RUPP, D.D.

At this day it is a commonly accepted proposition that the idea of Christ must be the ruling conception of a system of Christian theology. It is admitted that no system of theology can be regarded as strictly Christian that is ruled by any other than the Christological principle. This is what is meant by the statement now so widely accepted, that Christian theology, in order to be true to itself, must be Christo-centric.

Yet, in spite of this common admission, theological science, having been for ages determined by other leading ideas, is slow to submit to the dominative influence of this principle in the construction of its particular doctrines; so that, while the principle is generally accepted, there are still doctrines taught and preached, which are inconsistent with it, and which, therefore, are not truly Christian.

It is the aim of this paper to consider a few of the leading theological doctrines in the light of this principle, and to observe what influence this principle will have upon their construction and contents. Within the time and space at our command this can be done only in the most cursory way; while an exhaustive treatment of the subject would require the writing of a whole system of theology. What is proposed here is merely an illustrative treatment of a few themes belonging to each of the three departments into which theological science may be divided. If, therefore, we should fail to refer to any

subject which others may consider important, and which the title of our paper may perhaps suggest, the explanation of such omission must be found in the limitation of our time and space.

By the Christological Principle we understand the idea of an eternal union of God and man in the person of Christ, as the medium of God's perfect self-communication and self-revelation to the world, and the consummation of all His ways and works. This implies, on the one hand, that Christ is the principle of the divine constitution of the world, and that in Him, as St. Paul says, all things consist or hold together. He is not an accident or afterthought in the divine world-plan, but its central and determinative idea—the vital root as well as culminating head of all things. It implies, on the other hand, that Christ is the principle of all sound knowledge of God and of His ways and works. We can only know God and man aright in the light and inspiration of the Christ.

The idea of a real union of God and man, as it is presented in the teaching of the early Church, presupposes an original relation of affinity or kinship between the divine and human natures; and this is in agreement with the doctrine of St. John concerning the Divine Logos, as the archetypal source of the life and light of men. According to the old Chalcedonian Christology, the God-man, who is "consubstantial with the Father as to His divinity, and consubstantial with us as to His humanity, . . . is one Christ, existing in two natures without mixture, without change, without division, without separation,—the diversity of the two natures not being at all destroyed by their union in the person, but the peculiar properties of each nature being preserved, and concurring to one person, and one subsistence."

Such a conception of Christ is possible only on the assumption that the nature of God and the nature of man, notwithstanding their diversity, are not absolutely different or contradictory, but homogeneous entities. If these two natures were in their very constitution incommensurable and incompatible,

according to the assumptions and definitions of a later theology, then it would be impossible to think of their coexistence in one person, without confusion or change, and without division or separation. In that case there could either be no union at all, or else the union would result in a being of mixed nature that would neither be like God nor like man; as happens, for example, when two gases of opposite characters combine to form a substance whose qualities are different from those of either of the constituent elements.

But if Christ be in one person truly God and truly man, according to the teaching of this old Christological formula, which is the most precious inheritance that has come down to us from the early Church, then His being and life are truly a manifestation of the nature and character of God as well as of the nature and destiny of man. And this manifestation is the only adequate representation to human thought of either God or man. In consequence not merely of the abnormal condition of man, but of the necessary incompleteness of his development without Christ, neither God nor man can be truly known outside of and apart from Him. This is one of the fundamental implications of the Christological principle.

God can be known perfectly only in Christ. This proposition is not an arbitrary or unwarranted assumption; nor is it the product merely of speculation. It is the teaching of human experience, as well as the teaching of Christ Himself. The history of religion and philosophy proves that man never of himself alone attained to a true and worthy conception of God. Christ, therefore, says truly: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither does any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him." And in accordance with this St. John says: "No man has seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared Him."

The meaning of this is not that no sense or idea of God is possible at all without a knowledge of the historical Christ.

Such a proposition would be refuted by the existence of ethnic religions, which imply some revelation and knowledge of God in human consciousness. There is a manifestation of God in the constitution of the human mind, whose light is a ray derived from the eternal Reason or Logos: and there is a manifestation of God also in human experience, both internal and external. Hence the idea of God is a necessary product of our mental activity. The necessary operation of the laws of thonght and the feeling of absolute dependence impel the mind to the formation of the notion of an Absolute Being; which notion may be said to receive its contents from the immediate impression which the Absolute Being makes upon the human mind in experience or consciousness. And as the human soul is an offspring of God, deriving its being and nature from Him, the notion which it thus forms from itself must necessarily approximate more or less to the true conception of God.

But how much this notion comes short of the truth is apparent again from the conceptions of Deity which are found to prevail in ethnic religions. The fault of these ethnic conceptions is not simply that they are anthropomorphic. If the Christological principle be true, then there is truth in anthropomorphical or anthropological conceptions of God, and the application to Him of such conceptions is a legitimate process.* God though an infinite, absolute, unconditioned Being, must possess mental and moral qualities which ally Him to man, and justify the application to Him of conceptions derived from the contemplation of man and his actions. The error of anthropomorphism consists in this, that the conceptions by means of which God is represented to the understanding, are not derived from the highest and best, but from the lowest and worst types of manhood. The primitive imagination, which gives to the nations their gods, gets its first ideas of the character of Deity

* "To Christians, the incarnation is the final sanction of anthropomorphism, revealing the Eternal Word as strictly a person, in the ordinary sense and with all the attributes which we commonly attach to the name." Lux Mundi, p. 165.

from the character of the rulers and hunters of men, who, like Nimrod, or Ahasuerus in the tale of Esther, exercise arbitrary and despotic dominion over their fellow-men; and the god of the tribe thus becomes merely a magnified chieftain, possessing all the virtues and passions of the chieftain on an enlarged scale. Like the chieftain of the tribe, the god who is worshipped is a being that can be pleased and bribed with a gift, or appeased and propitiated by the sight of blood and torture.

It is not from these lowest and worst types of humanity, but only from the highest and best types that any true conception of the nature and character of God can be derived. But the highest type of manhood appears in Christ, who is not only a sinless man, but the ideal man—the man who embodies all the attributes of human nature in their highest perfection and in harmonious development. Hence it is only from the person and life of Christ that we can obtain the most accurate knowledge of the person and character of God. Christ is the most perfect revelation of God, because He is the most perfect man and, therefore, the most perfect medium for the manifestation of God in humanity. He is God manifest in the flesh. Therefore by comparison with the person and character of Christ we must correct and purify our ideas of God derived from every other source.

Now in the revelation of Christ, God is manifested, first of all, as a *rational* and *moral personality*, of which the human personality is but an imperfect image or copy. Various objections have been urged against the doctrine of the divine personality, which have at times been confusing even to Christian thinkers. These resolve themselves generally into the notion of a contradiction between the conceptions of personality on the one hand, and of absolute or unconditioned existence on the other. An *ego*, it is said, presupposes a *non-ego* as the condition of its development and self-consciousness. Self-consciousness results only in consequence of a distinction between subject and object. In answer to this, it may be said that, while this is true in regard to finite personality, it follows

by no means that it must be true also of the infinite. God, as infinite and absolute existence, may have the conditions of mental and moral life entirely within Himself. It is not necessary to think of absolute and unconditioned existence as being devoid of all inner processes and changes, but only as having the relations and conditions of these processes and changes entirely within itself. If the conception of absolute being necessarily required the notion of absolute simplicity and changelessness, then the absolute would be a dead and not a living being.

But for the Christian believer the conception of the personality of God is necessarily involved in the personality of Christ; and the necessary postulate of an inner diremption and process in the divine being in order to the existence of self-consciousness, is here met by the doctrine of a trinity of subsistences, or a three-fold hypostatic distinction, in the essence of the Godhead.* God could not be manifested in the form of human personality, if He were not Himself a personal being whose attributes are essentially the same as those which belong to our own personality. To Herbert Spencer's notion of the absolute as "a mode of being as much transcending intelligence and will as these transcend mechanical motion," the person of Christ is at once a full and final answer. In the being of Christ God is manifested as a person of like essential constitution as the human. God is a being that thinks, and wills,

* It does not come within the scope of our purpose here to discuss the doctrine of the Trinity. In a discussion of that doctrine, however, we should lay more stress upon the idea of the unity of the Divine Being than is often the case. Christ is God, and manifests not only a part, but the whole Godhead. There are not a few current conceptions of the Divine Being which ignore this truth. When, for example, the Father is represented as the *just* God, and the Son as the *merciful* one—the former as the God who demands satisfaction, the latter as the God who makes satisfaction in the sinner's stead; the former as hard of access and hard to be entreated, (δυσπαραίτητος), the latter as philanthropic and gentle—then we have something like the Greek conception of Zeus and Prometheus, but not the Christian doctrine of the Trinity.

and feels as man does, with this difference only, that what in man is finite and limited, is in God infinite—a difference which, however far it may separate God from man, is not inconsistent with the notion of an essential likeness. Though God's thoughts are as much higher than our thoughts as the heavens are higher than the earth, yet essentially they are thoughts like our thoughts; and the very reality of human knowledge depends upon the essential likeness of mental activity between God and man whereupon rests our ability of really "thinking God's thoughts after Him." * In essence or kind, then, God's knowledge is like our knowledge; But it is unlimited or infinite, and therefore God is *omniscient.* So God's volitional power is in its nature like ours; but it is unlimited by anything outside of God, and that makes God *omnipotent.* And, finally, there is sensibility or feeling in God, resembling that which forms an essential element of human personality, and differing from this only in being infinitely perfect in its exercise and action. Hence there is in God infinite love and mercy, infinite holiness and righteousness.

The central principle or truth in the revelation of Christ,

* If we are not mistaken, this is an expression of Sir John Herschell's, and refers to our knowledge of the material universe. The idea involved in the expression has important implications. Our knowledge of nature presupposes that there is thought in nature, corresponding to the thought of our own thinking. If nature contained no thought, no living ideas, no rational laws, then all our knowledge of nature would be unreal—an empty illusion. But if there is thought in nature, and if nature is a rational system, then it must be the product of the thinking of the author of nature, or God, who must therefore be a thinking, or spiritual, or personal being. And if we can know nature, by reading God's thoughts there, then we can also know God's mind, that is, God Himself, for mind is known by its phenomena. If this our knowledge of God is not real or true, then neither is our knowledge of nature real or true. It follows, then, that the only consistent agnosticism is *absolute* agnosticism. If we cannot know God, then neither can we know nature; and if we can know nature, we can also know God—*know*, that is, in the only sense in which any being can be known, namely, in or by its phenomena or qualities. The *being* of being cannot be known in any case.

that which conditions and illuminates every other truth, is the proposition that "God is love." Love was manifestly the actuating principle of the whole earthly life of Christ. It pervaded His whole conduct, and animated all His actions. It ruled all His words and works. And from this manifestation of love in the person and life of Christ the profoundest of all the Apostles drew the conclusion that *God is love*. This is the central and most fundamental determination or quality of the being of God. Holiness, and righteousness, and wrath are but modifications of this fundamental moral quality. Holiness may be defined as the self-respect of the divine love, in consequence of which God, in loving, must ever remain true to Himself, or to the idea of His being; righteousness, as the self-conservation of the divine love, in virtue of which this communicates itself and its blessings to personal beings only in the degree of their susceptibility and worthiness, and thus renders to each one his due; and wrath, as the indignation and pain which the divine love feels in consequence of its rejection by the beloved object, and which must manifest itself in the life and consciousness of that object as curse or penalty.*

It follows, then, that the conception of love must be the determinative principle in any true or Christian doctrine of God. No doctrine of God would be Christian at all that is ruled by any other conception; as, for instance, the conception of sovereignty, of honor, or of glory. And no conception of God can be Christian that represents Him as acting towards men from any other principle or motive than that of love. God is misrepresented, when His counsels and acts in relation to men are supposed to turn merely upon an arbitrary determination

* We do not think that there is any ground for the criticism that the idea of *retributive justice* is wanting in this view of God. On the contrary we believe that that idea here only receives its proper basis and its right definition. According to the above view of the divine justice, any being must suffer the divine wrath, in the form of inward moral torment or pain, so long as he does not stand in right relation to the law of holy love. This justice cannot be trifled with or cheated, nor can its penalty fall on any other than the guilty object.

of will without any rational motive or ground, or upon the bare selfish thought of His own honor and glory.

In the light of this Christological principle it will be apparent at once that any doctrine of predestination, for example, must be unchristian, which represents God as having from eternity, without any other cause or ground than the absolute pleasure of His will, fore-ordained some men and angels unto eternal life and others unto eternal damnation. To say that the motive of this fore-ordination to damnation is the manifestation of God's "most glorious justice," is to assume that there would be no manifestation of justice in the exercise of love in its own proper form, and to make sin and endless misery a necessity in order to the glory of God. What should be said of a God who would be willing to purchase His glory at such a price? Such a doctrine might perhaps be held consistently in connection with Herbert Spencer's notion of the Unknown Absolute, or in connection with the idea of the Syrian Baal, or the Tyrian Moloch; but it could not be held in connection with the idea of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and notwithstanding the fact that it has long played a part in Christian theology, we may be sure that it has not had a Christian origin.* A God who should dispose of His creatures, who are sentient and rational beings made in His own image, after the manner sup-

* St. Augustine, the author of the doctrine of reprobation, was for nine years, during the early part of his life, a member of the sect of the Manicheans, whose leading tenets were that matter is essentially evil, and that there are two eternal principles in the universe, one good and the other bad. May we not recognize in his doctrine of man as a "mass of perdition," and in his doctrine of a double divine decree of election and of reprobation, an echo of these Manichean conceptions, which, at any rate, were in the air of his age, from India and Persia to Italy and Africa? The notion of dualism is, indeed, overcome in Augustine's system, but only by transferring it into the divine will itself. Instead of two opposite principles in the universe, there are two opposite principles or tendencies in the one divine will—the one love, the other hate. See Herzog's Real Enc. Vol. I. p. 623. Old Edition.

posed by this doctrine, would certainly not be love, neither would He be a rational and just God.

The doctrine of predestination is a subject confessedly beset with difficulties. The difficulty consists in reconciling the notion of the divine sovereignty and omnipotence with the fact of human freedom. But whatever the solution may be, it must not do violence to the conception of the divine love. Sometimes, indeed, it is maintained that no solution is for us possible, but that we have here an antinomy of thought before which we must forever stand dumb, while nevertheless we are bound to acknowledge each of the opposed propositions involved in it. We imagine sometimes that we are saying a profound thing, when we say that the conceptions of universal divine love and of unconditional reprobation, which are irreconcilable in human logic, may be perfectly reconcilable in the logic of God: that perhaps there are mysteries in the being of God and in the constitution of the moral universe, of which we can never have any conception at all, but which may enable God to ordain and consign some of His creatures to perdition and yet at the same time to be perfectly just and good. Has not God the right to do with His creatures what He pleases? Does not this right inhere in the very fact that He is their Creator? Has not the potter power over his clay to make of it any sort of vessel that he may choose? Has the work any rights which the workman is bound to respect.

We may thus impose upon ourselves by playing in thought with the notion of unrevealed possibilities in the being of God, or with notions derived from unethical relations in the natural world. But the mist of such sophistry is at once dissipated when we consider God as really revealed in Christ. This revelation, at least so far as the moral character of God is concerned, and His will towards man, is not partial, but complete. God is light, and in Him there is no darkness at all. God is love; and there is in Him no will, tendency, or disposition that is not of love. There is in God no such dualism as would be implied in the supposition that, over against His revealed will that all men

should be saved, there stands another, an unrevealed, will that some should be damned for the enhancement of His glory. That texts of Scripture may be adduced in favor of such views, only shows that this is not the right way to use Scripture; for certainly a vastly greater number of texts, and these much less ambiguous in their meaning, may be adduced in favor of the opposite views. But it is not texts of Scripture, torn from their connections, invested with a sense which they were never intended to bear, and fitted into a metaphysical system of extra-biblical origin, that reveal God; but what does reveal God is Christ—the Christ alike of the Bible and of the Christian consciousness, which cannot oppose or contradict each other. But in this revelation of Christ, God stands forth in His whole moral character as love; and this love is of the same nature in God that it is in man: it worketh no ill to its object, but on the contrary seeks the good of all God's children. With this divine love no unconditional decree of reprobation can be consistent either in human or in divine logic.*

* It would not be consistent with our plan to discuss the doctrine of predestination here at length in its positive aspect. In this line, however, we would remark that, in our opinion, the Scriptural teaching on the subject is fully satisfied by the theory that predestination consists in the divine predetermination of the personal nature of every human being, and of his position and rank in the kingdom of Christ, while the realization of this destiny is left to be accomplished by the individual himself in the exercise of his personal freedom. This means that all men are created in Christ and ordained to salvation in different degrees of glory, but that under the concurrence of God's grace and providence, they must work out their salvation by free personal activity. This implies the reality of human freedom; and this again is only conceivable under the supposition of a limitation of the divine sovereignty. If this limitation be regarded as *self-limitation* it will not contradict the idea of the absoluteness of the divine being. It may be said that there is a difficulty in this conception. How are we to think of God as limiting His own knowledge and power? But the difficulty here is at most only an *intellectual one;* while the difficulty with the ordinary doctrine of election and reprobation is a *moral one*—a far more serious thing than the other. It is not the business of theology to solve all difficulties. In some cases it may be regarded sufficient *to have rightly located* the difficulties.

And as it is with the love, so also is it with the justice of God: this too is revealed in Christ, and is of the same essential character as that which the Christian mind universally recognizes under this term. Justice, according to an old definition, consists in giving to every one that which is his due (animi affectio suum cuique tribuens, Cicero says). According to the Christian conception of right, it would be wrong to impute to one person the sin and guilt of another, or to punish the innocent instead of the guilty. To maintain that God can properly do this would imply that His principles of right and wrong are essentially different from those which He originally implanted in the human soul, and which He now inculcates by means of the Gospel.

It has, at times, been assumed that this implication is in accordance with fact; and the doctrines of original sin and of the atonement have both been construed in the spirit of this assumption. While no human tribunal would dare to hold children responsible for the sins of their parents, yet it has been taught that God imputes the guilt of Adam's transgression to his posterity and punishes them as though they were personally guilty; and this in spite of the fact that the Prophet says: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son" (Ezek. 19: 20). So also it has been taught that, although Christ admonishes us to forgive men their trespasses as our heavenly Father forgives us, yet in reality, forgiveness is with God an impossibility, but that He has duly punished the sins of mankind in Christ, so that now justice is satisfied and some sinners at least, if not all, may go clear.*

* The following sentences, bearing upon the point under consideration, are quoted from Dr. A. A. Hodge by Prof. Briggs in *Whither*, p. 94: "God is no more able to relax the moral perfections of His law, or to remit the penalty as an act of sovereign prerogative, than He is able to lie or to deny Himself. *Therefore, He cannot forgive sin in any case.* The sinner may be forgiven, but the sin *must* be punished, either in the person of the sinner, or of his substitute. Therefore, the vicarious suffering of the penalty by Christ in the stead of His people was an absolute necessity to the end of

And in defence of these doctrines it has been claimed that God's righteousness may be different in kind from our righteousness—that, in fact, with God, whatever He wills to be right is right because He wills it, and whatever He wills to be wrong is wrong for the same reason, and that His will is not bound to any constant principle or rule. The Christian sense of right, therefore, is no criterion of what may be the sense of right in God.*

Now, besides many other things that might be said against this view, it must be said that, if it be true, then God is not fairly or truly revealed in Christ. Certainly Christ never acted on any other principles than those which commend themselves to our own best conscience. The Christ of the Gospels, the real Christ, in distinction from the Scholastic, ever acted on the same rational and moral principles on which we are required to act, namely, the principles of love, and mercy and justice; and in doing this He represented God, and proved that these are also His principles of conduct towards men. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth His works."

But Christ is human as well as divine; and therefore we have in Him a revelation of the nature and destiny of man as well as of the nature and character of God. Now, as we have already said, the very possibility of a manifestation of God in

their salvation." The *italics* in this quotation are ours. We would simply remark that, if the case stands thus between God and His law, then the question may arise: Which is sovereign, God or the law? Does not this view seriously endanger the idea of the divine sovereignty?

*Right, according to this view, is simply identical with might. If this were the essence of God's righteousness, then God would be a being that might be feared, but could not be respected or loved. It is against such a conception, and not against the Christian idea of God, of which he was probably ignorant, that J. S. Mill so vigorously protests in the following famous sentence: "I will call no being good who is not what I mean when I apply that epithet to my fellow-creature; and if such a being can sentence me to hell for not so calling him, then to hell I will go."

human nature implies an original constitutional kinship between God and man. It implies, what the Bible also tells us, that man, deriving his life and reason from God through the eternal Logos immanent in the universe as the law and energy of its development, is the offspring of God, and therefore an image and copy of God; and that God is in a real sense his Father.

If there be anything new and peculiar in the Christian revelation, as distinguished from other forms of revelation, so far as its bearing upon the doctrine of man is concerned, it is the emphasis which is here laid upon the idea of the fatherhood of God, and upon the idea of the divine descent and brotherhood of men. And this is an idea which no theory of creation or of evolution can shake or destroy. However we may suppose the existence of Adam to have been brought about, it remains true still, as St. Luke tells us (Luke 3: 33), that Adam was the son of God, and that, therefore, God was in a profound sense his Father. Indeed, it is easier to hold this idea in connection with the doctrine of evolution, which is now accepted, in one form or another, by all leading scientific thinkers, than in connection with the old doctrine of a mechanical creation; and the relation which it implies is one which sin, indeed, may have obscured for our consciousness, but which, as to its essential nature, it could neither destroy nor break without annihilating the very existence of man.

These ideas of the fatherhood of God and of the divine descent of man are, indeed, not entirely new in Christianity. Both heathens and Jews were more or less familiar with them long before the advent of Christ. Aryan heathenism, from India to Italy, was fond of designating its chief divinity by the term *father* (*Dyaushpitar*, *Ζεὺς πατήρ*, *Jupiter*) and of invoking him as father of Gods and men. And the Jewish prophets, in moments of highest exaltation, were wont to think of Jehovah as the Father of Israel, at least. But these ideas, while bearing testimony to a sense of their divine relationship in the minds of primitive men, remained barren of their proper results—in heathenism because of the prevailing polytheism,

and in Judaism because of the extreme contrariety that was believed to hold between God and man. In Judaism—at least during its later periods, when the object was to emphasize as much as possible the difference between God and man, which, in the time of Christ, had been pushed into sheer deism—the idea of the divine fatherhood was identified rather with the idea of external creatorship and ownership; as when, for example, Isaiah exclaims: "But now, O Lord, thou art our father; we are the clay and thou our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand."

The Christian conception of man as the offspring of God means a great deal more than that. It means that man is by origin and nature allied to God as the child is allied to the father. This conception invests human nature with a degree of dignity and worth that cannot belong to it in any other view. Man is not a *thing*, as is the vessel which the potter turns upon his wheel; but he is a child of God—the offspring of divine love. Every human soul is the realization of a divine thought begotten of the divine love, and therefore in the view and judgment of God a being of infinite value.*

It is, therefore, no evidence of healthy Christian thinking or piety to belittle man in order to magnify God; as is done for example, when man is described as a mere worm, a thing of naught, that is utterly unworthy of the slightest thought or

* The thought which, in the above paragraph, we have tried to express theologically, Lotze expresses philosophically in the proposition that the human soul "originates neither in the body nor in nothing, but goes forth from the substance of the Infinite with no less fullness of reality than all actual nature brought forth from the same source." By this procession of the soul from the Infinite, Lotze does not mean a blind or unconscious process of emanation, but a conscious, volitional act of the Infinite giving rise to a distinct state or mode of being within itself, which finally attains to the condition of self-existence or personality. Self-existence is not existence external to the Infinite and independent of it, but existence within the Infinite that has come to be for itself, thinking, feeling, willing and enjoying itself. These thoughts remind us of St. Paul's proposition, that "in Him we live, and move and have our being." Cf. Microcosmus, Book III., Chap. V. and Book IX., Chap. III.

care of God. Such views, though intended to glorify, must in the end tend to degrade God Himself; for, if man is not worthy of God's care and love, then God must be unworthily employed when He is caring for him and loving him, and that would reflect unfavorably upon His own character. Doubtless God is infinitely superior to man in wisdom, and power and goodness, and in all the attributes of His being; and man should not be proud of his nature and his endowments, for he has nothing that he has not received from God; but yet he should value himself at his true worth, and prove himself worthy of his exalted origin and relationship. Christ did not entertain the contemptuous view of man which has been entertained by some philosophers and theologians, when He spoke of the human soul as being of such transcendent value that it could not be exchanged for the whole world. And the tendency of Christianity has been in the direction of a higher appreciation of man as man. Among unchristian nations human life is valued at a very low price, and the man-slayer expiates his crime by the payment of a few coins, as was the case among our Teutonic forefathers. But as nations rise in the scale of Christian civilization the dignity of manhood is more and more appreciated and human life becomes more sacred.

It has been asserted, indeed, that the idea of the divine Fatherhood is simply a covenantal idea, and that it is applicable only tropically to God's relation to the regenerate. God, it is argued, is not in any true sense the Father of all men, but He is the Father only of those who are in Christ. But is there not a sense in which all men are in Christ? Not subjectively, of course, but objectively and essentially; not in respect of their own thought and consciousness, but in respect of their objective constitution and relations. Is not Christ the light that lighteth every man? Is He not the head of every man, and has He not tasted death for every man? If it be true that in some sense the first Adam was the head of the human race, affecting and in a measure determining, in the way of subconscious influence, both the physical and moral life of every

human individual, must not this be true in a far profounder sense of the Second Adam? We hold that in the organism of the human race Christ occupies a far more central and far more important position than that which belongs to the first man; and that, therefore, in some very real sense, every soul is related to Christ directly by nature, and that this relation needs only to be taken up into the consciousness and will in order to become the full substance of the Christian salvation. So, then, while it remains true that there is a vast difference between a Christian and one who is not a Christian, so far as their respective relations to God are concerned, it is true also that God is in a very real sense the Father of all men; and that this relationship is based both upon the fact that all human souls have their origin in the life of the Eternal Logos, and upon the fact that all stand in an essential relation to the Incarnate Logos as the organic Head of the whole race in its complete historical development.*

* In order to the complete tenability and intelligibility of the above positions, the Incarnation must be regarded as an *event* in the historical development of humanity, as well as an *advent*. It has been customary heretofore to regard it exclusively in the light of an advent. We have been accustomed to hear it said that God, or the Logos, "came down into humanity," or that "He entered it from the outside," and united Himself by a simply miraculous act, setting aside all the laws of human life, with human nature, in the person of one single man, the benefits of whose life and death are now believed to be available, in like external fashion, for the salvation of the rest of men. *This is Deism.* God and man stand entirely apart, and constitutionally have nothing in common with each other. They are first brought together, in a purely miraculous way—a way transcending all the laws of the universe—in Christ; and the effects of the union thus brought to pass are now supposed to be continued in the form of the Church, a wholly supernatural institution, outside of which there is neither divine life nor grace. It is not thus that the New Testament treats this great subject. This does not say that the Logos came into the world from the outside. "He *was in the world*," says St. John, "and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not." And this hidden immanence of the Logos in the world, in the human reason and conscience, in human life and history, became *manifest* at last in the incarnation. Thus the incarnation was an *event* as well as an *advent*. It was an advent inasmuch as it was a new

But if all men are God's children, then all men are also *brothers*. The idea of the brotherhood of men is a distinctively Christian or Christological idea. In the ancient heathen world this idea was prevented from spreading itself and bearing practical fruit by the prevailing polytheism. Different races and tribes of men were believed to be the offspring of different gods, and therefore not brothers, but enemies. In early Latin the word for *stranger* is the same as the word for *enemy*. And even in Christendom this idea of a brotherhood involving the further idea of an essential equality of al men, has been slow to take general possession of men's minds and to lead to its legitimate consequences. The idea has prevailed for ages, at times even claiming the authority and sanction of religion itself, that some men are by nature endowed with exclusive rights and privileges. Heaven itself was believed to have established a permanent difference between the nobility and the common people. The masses were supposed to exist for the sake of the classes. The weak, according to this view, were made to serve the strong; and the former have few rights which the latter are bound to respect. The life of a ruler is of more value than that of all his subjects, and that of one noble lord counts for more than that of many peasants. This idea is an inheritance which the Christian world has received from heathenism, and it is the direct opposite of the Christian doctrine of the equality and brotherhood of men. *

stage in the process of the divine self-communication to the world, giving rise to a new *æon* in the world's advancing development, but it was an event inasmuch as it grew out of the world's own life and in harmony with the essential laws of the same. In like manner, no doubt, the second advent will be an event also. Christ is in the world now, and His second advent will be but the visible manifestation of His presence and power.

* The Christian idea of men's relation to each other in organized society is expressed in the following words of Christ: "Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant, even as the Son of man came not to be

This Christian doctrine of human equality and brotherhood is at the present time enforcing itself with a power such as it has never displayed before. Of course it has always lain implicitly in the Gospel and in the Christian faith. Christ expressed it when He said, "One is your master, and all ye are brethren," and St. Paul when he said that "With God there is no respect of persons." But explicitly and practically, this view has not always prevailed in the Christian world, so as to control men's actions in relation to each other. In our day, however, it is beginning to manifest itself in power and with practical results—not, indeed, always in gentle forms, and by peaceful means, as might be desired, but with a steady aim at the end contemplated, namely, the reorganization of society on the principle of the recognition of the claims of personality.

The labor troubles and agitations of our time are an evidence of the working of this Christian leaven in the bosom of society. The laboring classes, who in other ages were without rights which the rich and great were bound to respect, have now found out that they too are persons and not things, and that consequently they have rights which they are entitled to maintain. And this is a truth which they have not learned from heathen religion, nor from human philosophy, but from the Gospel of Christ. It is but the practical application of that conception of human personality to which Christianity has given birth. In the age of the Apostles this conception presented itself to the

ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." Among a Christian people this is not intended to apply only to those exercising ecclesiastical, but also to those exercising civil functions. Christianity is not hostile to the institutions of government, and to the differences of position which these presuppose among men; but it would infuse a new spirit into these institutions, and declares that the institutions exist for the sake of men, not men for the sake of the institutions. Christianity also accepts as a fact the natural selection, or rather election, among men, in virtue of which some are more highly endowed with physical and intellectual gifts than others. But it teaches that the more highly endowed, or the more elect, have received their gifts for the sake of the less endowed, or the less elect, even as Christ, the Chief Elect, holds His gifts for the sake of all.

mind in such way as to enable men, in view of the dignity and worth of their personality, to be indifferent to their external conditions. The slave was taught that, though a slave, he had within himself a soul that was worth as much as that of his master; and the master was taught that, though he was superior to his slave in the flesh, yet in respect of his soul he was not a whit better. Accordingly St. Paul could, for prudential reasons connected with the peculiar circumstances of the time, advise slaves, even if they were in a position to obtain their liberty, to prefer rather to remain in bondage. But this state of feeling could not last always, and such advice could not be always followed, nor was it intended to be always followed. When once the slave had learned that he was a *man*, born with an equal right to freedom and to happiness as his master, he could not always remain willing to be a slave. And that is the truth which the oppressed classes have learned in our day. They have found out that they have rights as men which they are not enjoying; and hence come these socialistic agitations, in the presence of which we sometimes stand aghast, expecting that they will overthrow the foundations of society and involve the whole social fabric in universal disorder. There is doubtless much evil in these agitations; as there is in all revolutionary movements, when new ideas break forth upon the world, which, in consequence of the resistance of the old order of things, are able to make room for their existence and action only in the way of violence and destruction; so that there is some excuse at least for those conservative theologians, especially on the other side of the Atlantic, who can see in these "democratic commotions" nothing but the spirit of Anti-christ warring against the Lord and against His anointed.

We on this side, however, who are not afraid of democracy, but rather regard it as a form of organized human existence most congenial to the spirit of Christianity, which teaches that all God's children are endowed with equal rights as to liberty and happiness, and that all as bearers of the divine image are equally representatives of the divine authority and power over

the earth—we look upon these commotions as the birth-throes of a new and better order of society. The slaves who built the pyramids of the Pharaohs never went on strikes and never gave their masters any trouble. They knew not that they had rights which they might maintain. When under-fed, and over-worked, and abused, they simply laid down and died. But men in our day have found out the truth that *they have rights as men;* and there will be no rest or peace now until this truth shall have been generally acknowledged. It is the Gospel of the equality and brotherhood of men that is responsible for this stir in the world. God is behind it, and the noise and commotion will not cease until society shall have been regenerated, and the reign of peace and love and righteousness shall have come to bless the world.

God as revealed in Christ is a God the determinative impulse of whose life is love; who loves all His children with an equal and eternal love, and who eternally desires and seeks their well-being. This beneficent love of God, as manifested in Christ, directed towards sinners, impressed upon them by the Holy Spirit, and looking to their salvation, is what we understand by the *grace* of God.*

The grace of God, which has appeared in Christ, and which

* The Greek word χάρις (from the root of χαίρειν, *to rejoice*, akin to χαρά, *joy*, and to the Latin *carus*, *beloved*), like the English *grace*, is used in a twofold, namely, in an objective and in a subjective sense. Objectively it signifies beauty or propriety of form and action—that quality in a person whose contemplation affords to another a sense of delight or joy. Subjectively it signifies *favor*, *kindness*, *good-will*, expressing itself in beneficial acts, and implying some feeling of pleasure or joy in the object towards which it is directed. The word is also used subjectively to express the sense or feeling of such kindness on the part of the person benefited, and then means *thanks* or *gratitude*, like *gratiæ* in Latin. In the New Testament it is used in both of these subjective significations, but most frequently in the former, and when used of God denotes His good and beneficent will towards men as manifested in Christ, and effecting their salvation. In this divine favor there must be an element also of delight or joy, which may be considered possible in view of God's looking upon men not merely as sinners, but as redeemed in Christ.

is saving to all men (ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, Tit. 2 : 11), is not an impersonal substance or force, something separable from God, and capable of producing effects apart from Him; but it is a feeling or disposition of God—His will determined by His love—and directed towards the sinner in such way as to accomplish in his soul a specific moral result. That result is the remission of sin, that is, the extinguishment of its guilt and the destruction of its power, and the formation of a Christian or Christ-like character; and this result is brought to pass, not in the way of a physical, but in the way of a moral process, that is to say, through the conscience and will of the human subject. In the work of grace the personality of man is not ignored or suppressed, but recognized and respected. And the sinner is not treated as if he were a mere *thing*, a machine, for example, whose defects, if it have any, can be remedied by an external or mechanical operation, but as a personal spirit, self-existent (*für-sich-seiend*) and self-determined, whose nature can be affected and improved only through its own intelligence and will coming in contact with a higher and better personality.

There is something like moral tonic in the contact of a great and good personality. A great and good man exercises a wide moral influence. Those who come in contact with him are elevated and made better. A subtle power, sometimes called magnetism, seems to emanate from the soul of such a man and to insinuate itself into the souls of those around him, with the effect of elevating and improving their mental and moral character. So in the contact of the soul with Christ, through the operation of the Spirit by means of the Gospel, in which contact there is felt the very beating of God's pure and loving heart towards men, there is new moral and spiritual life for the sinner. This comparison is not intended, of course, as an explanation, but only as a distant analogy, serving dimly to illustrate the mode of operation of the gracious power of Christ upon the souls of men.

During His earthly life Christ came in contact with sinners

of every shade and degree; and whenever there was a proper response to His Spirit in their souls, the result was that they became new moral beings. A two-fold effect was produced in their consciousness: first a feeling of pardon, or of the remission of the guilt of sin on the part of God; and, secondly, a feeling of new moral power and aspiration, enabling the sinners to live a new moral life, conformable to the life of their great Benefactor. Christ said to the sinner: "Be of good courage; thy sins are forgiven thee; sin no more." And the gracious words of absolution at once carried into the heart of the sinner a new moral power, so that he was able to go away and begin a new moral life. And that is the way in which the grace of God in Christ now operates by the Holy Spirit. In the spirit Christ Himself comes into immediate contact with the human soul; and in such contact there is a quickening energy capable of transforming the sinner morally and spiritually into a new being. The Spirit is not a substitute for Christ, but the medium of Christ's own personal presence in the church and among men; and the office of the Spirit in the work of grace is not to exercise an independent creative activity in the soul, as the consequence of a legal transaction either between Christ and God the Father, or between Christ and the divine attribute of justice; but the office of the Spirit is to awaken in the soul a sense of Christ's presence in the fullness of His grace, as the condition of personal conjunction with Him and of moral transformation through Him.*

Should it be objected that this seems to be turning the grace

* The notion that Christ came into the world simply to make satisfaction for sin to the divine law by suffering its penalty, so that the way might thus be legally opened for the Holy Spirit to perform the work of purifying and sanctifying men's souls, which is sometimes represented as the "plan of salvation," is altogether too mechanical a conception to commend itself to the best Christian thought. Christ, in this scheme, becomes merely a helping factor, instead of the central principle of salvation. The real work of salvation, that of restoring the soul to *moral soundness* or *health*, belongs not to Christ, but to the Holy Spirit. This is not Christological or Christocentric doctrine.

of God into mere moral influence, and to leave no room for the idea of anything substantial or ontological, that has usually been connected with it, we would reply that in all moral processes there is something ontological; and that this is especially the case in the moral process of love, which is the very essence of the relation between the Christian soul and Christ. In perfect love, such as is the love of God in Christ, there is a perfect flowing together and mutual indwelling of the persons loving, of course without the loss of independent personality or self-existence in either. When St. Paul prays for the Ephesians that, they "having become rooted and grounded in love, Christ may dwell in their hearts through faith," and that "they may be filled with all the fullness of God," this does not imply merely an ideal inhabitation of Christ in their thoughts and affections, but a substantial personal union with them. And in such union of the soul with Christ, which, though moral as conditioned by faith and love, is yet substantial and real, there is a new-creative, regenerative and sanctifying force for the sinner.

The grace of God is by no means a mere passive feeling or disposition in God's mind. The sinner is not saved simply in consequence of something that passes in the mind of God—some immanent purpose or resolve, or in consequence of something that passes between the persons of the Godhead—some covenant or contract between the Father and the Son; as if he were admitted into the realms of the blest and made happy merely by the imputation to him of a righteousness not his own; but he is saved in consequence of something that takes place in his own soul. The love or grace of God in Christ is not merely an immanent activity in the mind of God, but a transitive activity, that passes over from the heart of God into the heart of the sinner—though not, of course, by crossing over any intervening space—and there becomes a regenerative, re-creative power.

But though thus creative, the grace of God does cease to be strictly a moral force. Though exerting a regenerative in-

fluence upon the nature or substance of the soul, it never becomes a mere physical energy. This implies that its effects are always conditioned by the freedom of the human subject. It does not produce its results with the necessity and irresistible regularity which belong to a law or force of nature. The grace of God, in itself considered, is universal, contemplating the salvation of every human soul; but it does not compel the salvation of a single one. The conception of divine grace as an arbitrary election, choosing for salvation, out of the whole mass of sinful humanity, a certain number of men, who are by nature not less sinful and depraved than the rest, and then fitting these for their destiny by a series of divine operations, legally conditioned or made possible by the atoning work of Christ, and distinguished as prevenient, operative and co-operative grace, which grace is practically irresistible in all its stages—this conception belongs to a system of theology, which, whatever else may be said of it, is at least not Christological; for it attributes neither to Christ nor to man the dignity and worth which the Christological principle implies. A system of theology does not become Christological, or Christo-centric, by bringing in Christ at a certain point and making Him play a subordinate *rôle*, such as that of satisfying the abstract notion of justice, and thus making possible the accomplishment of the absolute decree of election. In a system like that the idea of Christ may indeed be present, but it is not the central or ruling idea.

The Christological principle compels us, in view of the universality of Christ's humanity, and in view of the disclosure of the divine life in Christ as absolute love, to assume the universality of God's grace. It compels us to assume that God wills the salvation of every human soul, and that He must therefore exhibit and grant His saving grace to every one. If it appears that in the present life all men do not receive the offer of God's saving grace, it only follows that we are bound to enlarge our conception of the limits of the reign of grace; and if in this way room should be made for the salvation of a larger number of men than has usually been conceded by the

estimates of our narrow theology, we should rather rejoice and be glad than allow ourselves to fret and scold in petty jealousy and spite because some of our theology has been spoilt. But the Christological principle compels us also to assume that the saving grace of God treats men as men, worthy of the divine love, by respecting the freedom of their personality, and not as *things*, by becoming irresistible, and overthrowing the very foundation of their spiritual life. The idea of the power of divine grace has been magnified in the interest of the divine glory. It has been thought that the glory of God would be somewhat diminished, if anything were left to the voluntary choice of man himself, in the work of his own salvation. But we believe that a profounder way of thinking on the subject will show that there is more glory in saving a free personal spirit, that has power even to oppose the pressure of God's saving love, as a necessary correlate of the power of free acceptance, than there would be in saving a mere block or stone that could offer no resistance.

In close connection, historically and logically, with the conception of divine grace as an irresistible force, appears the idea which regards it somehow as an impersonal substance or influence—a sort of spiritual fluid, that has been separated from Christ and deposited in the church as in a reservoir, to be conveyed from thence to individual souls now by men fitted for this office by particular physical ceremonies, and through ordinances divinely appointed as conducting channels or conduits; the effect being supposed to be conditioned always upon the correct investiture of the officiating persons, and upon the correct manipulation of the ordinances; as the desired effect of some magic charms is believed to depend upon the due performance of certain unintelligible rites. This idea also violates the Christological principle; for according to this principle the embodiment or substance of the divine grace is Christ Himself, who is always personally present with us and working for our salvation, not by magical, but by rational and moral means;

that is, means which stand in some intelligible relation to the end to be accomplished.*

And the exercise of this saving activity or grace of Christ among men gives rise to the church. The church is not in itself a source, but an object and product of salvation. The church does not save, but is saved; and for the individual units that compose its membership it is the sphere of salvation, as the human body is the sphere of transformation for the elements of matter that enter into its constitution. "Christ loved the church and gave Himself up for it; that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of the water with the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing." The church is not an institution established in order to receive and convey the grace of Christ, but the continuous product of that grace in its saving activity among men; as the flame of the lamp is the continuous product of the combination of the carbon of the oil and the oxygen of the atmosphere. Neither is the church a substitute for Christ; as though Christ Himself were absent in heaven, and were carrying on His work here on earth now through the church by means of chosen representatives or vicars; but it is the body of Christ, in which Christ Himself is immediately present to every member. The representation of the church as the body of Christ is a figurative expression of the idea that it is a society whose members are bound together by a solidarity of spiritual life and interest, which has its foundation in their common union with Christ. The church is, therefore, not an institution that is created by a power outside

* The difference of the two conceptions of grace which are here contrasted, is of immense importance for the historical development of Christianity; for as one or the other of these conceptions prevails, we get courses of development and systems of religious life that are as wide apart as the poles. The one is largely a system of superstition and outward formalism; the other of rational faith and inward piety—the one prevailingly *magical*, the other prevailingly *ethical*. And these opposite conceptions and systems have their origin in different conceptions of the incarnation and of the person of Christ.

of itself, but an organism that grows by an immanent force, howbeit under the modifying influence of the personal units that compose its membership.* As the continuous product of

* The conception of the church as a growing organism ought to settle all debates concerning the question of a legitimate ministry and polity. The orders of the ministry and the governmental polity of the church were not fixed from the beginning, in the way of supernatural divine ordination, but were left to develop themselves according to the demands of times and circumstances in succeeding ages. If any particular form of church government is revealed in the New Testament, we believe that it is the Congregational; though that by no means settles the question of organization for all time. That form of governmental polity must be considered most legitimate and most divine which, at any particular time and place, best answers the purpose and produces the best results. As an organism the church must be essentially one; although that oneness does not necessarily require what is now commonly called "organic unity," that is, unity of outward political organization. The conception of a physical organism, in which the different organs or members must necessarily be in physical or local contact with each other, probably gives rise in some minds to the notion that there can be no real unity of the church without unity of outward organization. But the church is a *spiritual* organism, and its members may therefore be spiritually one, although belonging to different ecclesiastical bodies. There may be more than one fold, and yet but one flock and one shepherd. See John 10:16, R. V. There is more than one family (*πατριά*) in heaven and earth, but they are all named from one Father, and in Him they are all one. See Eph. 3:15, Greek and R. V. In Christ all *Christians* are essentially one, no matter to what different organizations they may belong and by what different names they may be called. And if once this spiritual and essential unity, which is not a nominalistic abstraction, but a profound reality, were properly recognized and acknowledged, there would be less need felt for external unity, and less anxiety and labor for it that will probably remain fruitless to the end of time. In the sense of external organization the Church never was one at any period in the past, and never will be one in the future, until her historical development in time shall be completed. When there shall be but one state organization throughout the world, then there may also be but one church organization, not sooner. The entertaining of these views, however, should not blind any one to the inconveniences and wrongs arising out of the many divisions into which the church is at present outwardly split up, and many of which have originated in no real moral and religious interest at all, but either in mere theological trifles, such as questions concerning the mode of baptism, or in party prejudice and passion.

the grace of Christ, the church is the communion of saints; and as the body of Christ, in and through which He exercises His regenerating and converting grace, she is the mother of saints.

In the Word and Sacraments Christ is spiritually present to the soul as the author of salvation, in the former offering, and in the latter sealing and communicating His renewing and sanctifying grace to the believer. The sacraments are not channels for the conveyance of something called grace from an absent Christ, but signs of Christ present in the Church and standing in an immediate relation of creative love to the souls of the faithful. And they are efficacious signs, that is, signs producing the effects which they signify; or they are seals, pledging the reality and presence of the grace which they represent, and rousing and confirming the faith of the recipient, whereby he accepts and appropriates the grace that is signified and offered. As visible symbols attached to the promises of the Gospel, without which they have neither meaning nor force, they are aids and supports to faith. This is in agreement with the old observation that, while God does not need sacraments for the bestowment of His grace, man needs them for the reception and appropriation of it. The grace is not a physical, but a moral good, and can therefore not be infused into the soul by a physical operation; it can only be received by a moral process—a process involving the intelligence and will of the receiving subject; and to initiate and sustain this process is the design of the sacraments. This does not imply, however, that their efficacy is merely subjective, or, in other words, that the faith of the subject gets out of them only what the imagination has first deposited therein. There is in them, as instrumental signs and organs by which Christ makes His presence and power felt in the Church, an objective efficacy and force; but this force is

To help to heal some of these divisions will, therefore, be a noble work; but this healing will probably come, not so much by making direct war upon the existing divisions, as by promoting a proper sense of the already existing higher unity.

moral in its nature and can produce its proper effects only when met by a corresponding moral condition in the soul. It follows, then, that while the sacraments are true and efficacious signs of divine grace, in the sense that the grace signified, that is, some particular energy of divine love, is always present, they do not accomplish their effects *ex opere operato*, that is, in consequence of the mere performance of the physical ceremony, like some magic rites or charms; for these effects always depend upon the faith or freedom of the recipient. Where there is no faith in the recipient, there the grace of God is exhibited too, in word and sacraments, but it does not accomplish its proper results.

III.

THE NEW BIRTH.

BY REV. CALVIN S. GERHARD, A.M.

It is a remarkable fact that on a subject of such vast importance, and one so clearly defined in the Scriptures, as the new birth, there should be so much difference of opinion among Christians. Many claim that it is brought to pass through baptism, whilst others declare that it is an experience and has nothing to do with baptism. Between these two positions there are various shades of belief, but all Christians hold, in some sense, either to the one or the other opinion named; they either believe in some form of baptismal regeneration, or accept some form of the experimental theory.

How are we to account for this variety of beliefs? Why does one large portion of the Protestant Church see no meaning in baptism, except as a test of obedience, or a sign of grace otherwise bestowed? Why has there been such a falling away, not only from the teachings of the Roman and Greek Churches, but also from the doctrine of the sacraments, as held in the early Church, and the Reformation Churches? And, moreover, why have the Churches, which lay but little, if any stress on the sacraments as grace-bearing ordinances, made such rapid progress in nearly all Protestant countries? How are we to account for the rise and swift advancement of Puritanism, and the various forms of Methodism? Must it not be admitted that it is largely due to the fact that the sacramental theory of religion has in a great measure lost its hold upon the masses? They believe in conversion, but do not believe in baptism. They readily admit the necessity of the new birth, but cannot see what baptism has to do with it.

Who now is responsible for this unscriptural method of thinking? Must it not be the fault of the Church itself? Surely there must be some mistake about the manner in which the subject has been presented, not only by those who undervalue its importance, but also by those who recognize the position which the sacrament of baptism occupies in the New Testament Scriptures.

In these days of creed revision, and intense theological activity, may not perhaps the subject of baptism also be restudied and restated with profit? Is it not the duty of the Church to formulate the doctrine in such a manner as to meet the peculiar needs of the age? Believing that such is the case, the following paper has been prepared and is offered as a humble contribution toward the performance of this important work.

In taking up the subject let us first of all call to mind how the New Testament Scriptures speak of water, of washing, of baptism as connected in an important manner with our salvation. "Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word." Eph. 5: 26. "Let us draw near with a true heart in fullness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Heb. 10: 22. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3: 5. "John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Acts 1: 5. "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Acts 10: 47. "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water and the eunuch said, behold here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Acts 8: 36. "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,

and lo! I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28 : 19–20. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark 16 : 16. "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts 2 : 38. "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts 22 : 16. "The like figure, whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 3 : 21. "But according to His mercy He saved us, through the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He poured out on us richly, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Titus 3 : 5–6. "Are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death? We were buried therefore with Him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." Rom. 6 : 3–4. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3 : 26–27.

What now do the Saviour and His apostles mean by this language? This question has been repeatedly asked and answered since the Christian Church was founded. The early Christians wrestled with it just as we do. But they, unlike the the modern Church, answered it with remarkable unanimity. Not only the Fathers of the Church, without a single exception, but even all heretics, who acknowledged the binding authority of the Sacred Scriptures, emphasized the prominence and importance of the sacrament of baptism as a means of grace.

Justin who suffered martyrdom A.D. 165, says in his First Apology to Antoninus Pius: "They who are persuaded and do believe that those things which are taught by us are true, and do promise to live according to them, are directed first to pray and ask of God, with fasting, the forgiveness of their former

sins, and we also pray and fast together with them. Then we bring them to some place where there is water, and they are regenerated by the same way of regeneration by which we were regenerated, for they are washed with water in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit. For Christ says, 'Unless you be regenerated, you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.'"

Irenæus, who perished A.D. 202, says in his "Work Against Heresies:" "For He (Jesus Christ) came to save all persons by Himself, all, I mean, who by Him are regenerated unto God,—infants, and little ones, and children, and youths and elder persons." "Giving to the disciples the power of regeneration unto God, He said to them, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'"

Next we will turn to Tertullian, A.D. 220, in whose "Tract on Baptism" we find this strong language: "Impious men raise cavils and say, 'Baptism is not necessary for those that have faith, which is sufficient, for Abraham, without any sacrament of water, but of faith only, pleased God.' But in all matters, the later injunctions bind, and the following rules take place above those that were before. Though there was salvation formerly by bare faith, before our Lord's passion and resurrection, yet when the faith is enlarged to believe in His nativity, passion and resurrection, there is an enlargement of the sacrament, the sealing of baptism, as it were a garment of our faith, which formerly was bare, but cannot now be without its law, for the law of baptizing is given, and the form of it appointed; 'Go, says He, teach the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' And when to this law that rule is added, 'Except one be regenerated of water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven,' it has bound up faith to a necessity of baptism."

Origen, the father of Biblical criticism and exegesis, A.D.

254, in his "Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans," speaks as follows: "The Church had from the Apostles a tradition to give baptism even to infants. For they to whom the divine mysteries were committed knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the Spirit."

Cyprian, A.D. 258, in his "Epistle to Fidus," bears this testimony: "If anything could be an obstacle to persons against their obtaining the grace, the adult and grown and elder men would rather be hindered by their more grievous sins. If, then, the greatest offenders, and they that have grievously sinned against God before, have, when they afterward come to believe, forgiveness of their sins, and no person is kept off from baptism and the grace, how much less reason is there to refuse an infant, who, being newly born, has no sin, save that being descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from his very birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened? Who comes for this reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own, but others' sins that are forgiven him."

Next we turn to Chrysostom, A.D. 407, who says, in one of his Homilies: "But our circumcision, I mean the grace of baptism, gives cure without pain, and procures to us a thousand benefits, and fills us with the grace of the Spirit, and it has no determinate time, as that had, but one that is in the very beginning of his age, or one that is in the middle of it, or one that is in his old age, may receive the circumcision made without hands. In which there is no trouble to be undergone, but to throw off the load of sins and receive pardon for all foregoing offences."

We will conclude these testimonies with a selection from Augustine, A.D. 430, the most influential and illustrious of all the Latin fathers of the Church. In his letter to Boniface he says: "Let not that disturb you that some people do not bring their infants to baptism with the faith that they may be by spiritual grace regenerated to eternal life, but because they

think they do procure or preserve their bodily health by this remedy. For the children do not therefore fail of being regenerated because they are not brought by the others with this intention. For infants are offered for the receiving of the spiritual grace, not so much by those in whose hands they are brought, though by those, too, if they be good and faithful Christians, as by the whole congregation of saints and faithful men. So that the whole Church of saints does this office as a mother. For the whole Church brings forth all her children and the whole brings forth each particular."

These quotations are given as specimens of the faith which prevailed universally in those early days. In subsequent ages the doctrine was differently stated, but less than these quotations contain was never believed before the time of the Reformation. Since the Reformation, however, the work of evisceration has been going forward, until to-day, perhaps the majority of Protestants see no meaning in baptism, except as an ordinance appointed by our Lord, and therefore not to be omitted, although it is regarded only as a sign, or at most, as a seal, but not as a means of grace.

Some representative men go even further than this. The great London preacher and author, Rev. Dr. Joseph Parker, says in a sermon on Matthew 3: 1–6: "Is it possible that there are men and women amongst us to-day, squabbling with one another about the matter of baptism? With what baptism you have been baptized I care not—if you have been baptized with the dew of the morning, sprinkled with hands prelatic or archiepiscopal—care not if you have been plunged in the middle of all the great seas that roll round the earth. Such baptism is nothing if it has not been followed by the true baptism of blood and fire. Into what baptism, then, have we been baptized? I believe that a sound argument can be set up in favor of the suggestion that in Christian baptism since the apostolic days there is no water at all. It does not follow that you must have water in order to have baptism, but, my friend, if you want the Atlantic, have it; if the drop of dew

trembling on the rosebud will suffice you, take it, but they are both nothing but ritualism, ceremonialism and superstition, if you do not seize the inner meaning, cry for the laver of blood, and mightily implore God to visit you with the baptism of fire."*

With the teachings of the New Testament before us, which we have already quoted, in reference to the nature, importance and benefits of the sacrament; with the unanimous interpretation of the early Church, as to the meaning of these declarations, and with the strong sacramental statements in the doctrinal Confessions of the 16th and 17th centuries, how are we to account for the history of the doctrine since the Reformation, and its present status in Protestant countries?

Undoubtedly the prominence which was given by Calvin and others to the doctrine of absolute predestination, by making it the centre of their system of thinking, struck the first and heaviest blow at the correct conception of the Church as the mystical body of Christ. Their system of thought led them to believe in the dualistic fiction of two churches, one visible and the other invisible. To the invisible church all the elect belong, whether they are members of the visible church or not. They are gathered out of the whole human race. And since there are many unworthy members in the visible church, who show by their lives that they are not of the elect, therefore baptism cannot actually confer grace, but is only the sign and seal of grace, which is present or absent, as the Divine decree determines. This theory necessarily undermined the Scriptural doctrine of the Church and the sacraments, and gave a special impetus to the tendency which set in with the Reformation of laying undue stress on the word of God as a means of grace. Perhaps already the early Church, but certainly the medieval Church, did not sufficiently appreciate the position which the word occupies in the work of regeneration, whilst modern Protestantism magnifies the office of the word at the expense of the sacrament. But the word and the sacrament are both

* "These Sayings of Mine," page 64.

employed by our Lord to produce regeneration. Each is a means of grace, and each according to its own nature conveys grace to the believer. The office of both is to bring the individual as a person into living union with the Lord Jesus Christ as a person, and to keep him in such union with his Lord.

Ignoring the necessity of faith, the Church during the Middle Ages overlooked the office of the word in regeneration, and fell into the error of teaching that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*. Accordingly regeneration was ascribed to the external act of baptism. The Bible was neglected and forgotten, and religion became almost exclusively a matter of outward performances. The Reformation rescued the Scriptures from their oblivion, and restored the word to its proper place in the economy of salvation. Since that time the Bible has never been neglected, but its importance has been falsely emphasized at the expense of the Church and the sacraments.

Martensen claims that through baptism a germ of new life is implanted into the soul, and that this germ will develop into personal regeneration, provided the proper conditions are at hand. Of this theory Van Oosterzee says: "By baptismal grace men often think, without Scriptural warrant (and this idea cannot be too earnestly resisted in principle), that in baptism as such there is already given from above an actual germ of new life, which they need only to preserve and develop, to remain assured of their personal share in the benefits of the kingdom of God. Could anything tend more to promote the most dangerous self-deceit, and to deprive of all its force the summons to that personal conversion the beginning of which some have to make even in advanced years? . . . As an emblematic act," continues Van Oosterzee, "baptism is, and remains for us a sign and seal of that which God in Christ will not only give us one day, but which He actually does give to the believer who is baptized. This, however, does not justify us in speaking of an immediate operation of grace, by and through baptism in itself, or of a proper imparting of the life of Christ in

this holy sign, and still less, as is now and then done, in talking of a heavenly corporeity, whose hidden foundation is laid in baptism."*

According to the Scriptures, baptism is best defined as the door of admission into the Church, the sign and seal of the forgiveness of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost to believers, and to children presented by believers, obligating them in the most solemn manner to continuous repentance, faith and obedience. Acts ii: 41, 47. Acts xxii: 16. Acts ii: 38–42. Further than this we dare not go. We have no authority for the statement that the grace of baptism is infused into the soul as a germ of life to be looked upon as dormant or active, according to the conditions at hand.

The fundamental error of such a theory is that it carries with it a physical conception, and consciously or unconsciously regards grace as something separable from Christ. Otherwise it would not speak of vehicles and channels. But the word and the sacraments are not viaducts, conveying grace from an absent Saviour. They are organs of Christ's mystical body the Church, securing His presence and uniting believers with Him. Christ is always present in the sacrament, so that baptism is not only the sign and seal of grace, but also its actual bestowment. But the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ can be received only by faith, through which alone the soul appropriates spiritual gifts. Through the Holy Ghost the proper conditions, faith and repentance are secured, and spiritual life is begotten; but this cannot be said to be already imparted through baptism, for only through faith does the grace of the sacrament become operative, which faith the sacrament cannot of itself produce.

Whence then does faith proceed? How does the Holy Ghost originate it? The Apostle tells us that it comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God. The word of God, therefore, co-operates with the sacrament, and through their joint instrumentality the new life is begotten. "Without the word," as

* Van Oosterzee's Christian Dogmatics, Vol. II., page 753.

Dorner so admirably expresses it, "the sacraments could only influence man by magic, outward or inward. But the word addresses itself to the intelligence, that the intelligence may arouse the will, thus giving rise to Christian faith, which cannot exist without knowledge of Christ, because it would lack its object, which cannot be given by purely inward spiritual influence, but only by the preaching of the word."*

Accordingly we find that in the Scriptures regeneration is not ascribed exclusively to baptism, but also to the word. St. Peter says: "Love one another from the heart fervently; having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God, which liveth and abideth." 1 Peter 1: 22, 23. And St. James: "Of His own will He brought us forth by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of His creatures." James 1: 18. In Ephesians 5: 26, St. Paul directly combines the word with the sacrament and says, "Even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word." Of this passage, Dean Alford says: "The word preached and received is the conditional element of purification—the real water of spiritual baptism—that wherein and whereby alone the efficacy of baptism is conveyed; that wherein and whereby we are regenerated, the process of sanctification being subsequent and gradual."†

Baptism is the bath of regeneration, but the abiding and working seed of the new life is the word of God. "Dropt into the soul of man," says the author just quoted, "it takes up the soul by Divine power into itself, and develops the new life continually. This," he adds, "is in the most precise and satisfactory sense the seed of God, and on this all Scripture symbolism is agreed, 1 Peter 1: 23, James 1: 18."‡

The conclusion we arrive at, therefore, is that we are born

* System of Christian Doctrine, Vol. IV. Page 272.

† Alford's Greek Testament *in loco*.

‡ Alford's Greek Testament, 1 John 3: 9.

again of water and the Spirit by the word. And just this is the reason why the sacrament is never administered without the word. With its administration are always connected a statement of its nature, profession of faith, vows and promises. It is these that give it significance and efficacy. The sacrament establishes a new relation with Jesus Christ, but the word, awakening faith, makes this relation organic, that is, living. In other words, baptism sets the graft, whilst faith is the organ through which alone the life of the vine can flow into the branch.

Ordinarily, as in the case of infants, the sacrament comes first. With adults the word takes the precedence. That is to say, the truth of the Gospel addressing itself, through the Holy Ghost, to the mind and heart, works in their case as a regenerating power before baptism is administered. But only after the individual is incorporated with the church, through the sacrament, is the gracious covenant relation consummated, by means of which regeneration is fully brought to pass.

Whilst therefore the validity of baptism rests on its Divine institution, and on its administration according to the command of the Saviour, and is not modified, either by the character and faith of the administrator, or the recipient, its efficacy depends altogether on faith, generated in the heart by the Holy Ghost, through the preaching of the word. This must be admitted even in reference to infants, unless we assume a magical effect in baptism, in their case. This has often been done, and is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church to-day. Many Protestants, on the other hand, ignore the grace of the sacrament altogether and consider it highly meritorious and orthodox to advocate the unconditional salvation of *all* children—provided they die. The Lord, without the use of any means, and in a manner wholly unknown to us, it is believed, invariably transforms dying infants into saints, and thus fits them for heaven.

Even so fine a scholar and acute a thinker as Prof. E. D. Morris, of Lane Theological Seminary, says: "In the case of adults, repentance and faith, as personal and voluntary experi-

ences, are indispensable to the application of the salvation which Christ has provided. But dying infants are saved without repentance, in the ordinary sense of that term; they are saved without faith, in the sense in which faith is experienced by the adult disciple on earth. In general the manner of their salvation differs distinctly from that through which we enter into the kingdom of grace. Shorter and sweeter methods are substituted in their case. By a process deeper than conscious volition, and antecedent to all moral choices, their spiritual state is from the moment of death Divinely determined, so that they are truly saved before responsible action commences, and their new life is, from the first, not one of testing with possible fall or failure, but one of holiness instant and above all change."*

Now what puzzles us is this: If it be such an easy matter to transform infants into perfect saints when they die, why is it so difficult to secure their salvation in case they live. Why does the Lord not put forth more power, and establish infants in holiness in this world, in the same manner in which it is claimed He does it in the world to come? Nay, more! Why does He not, in a similar way, save everybody?

If the doctrine of immediate justification and sanctification at death be true, "then" says Dr. Briggs, "blessed are those who die in infancy, and thus out-strip their fellows in the Christian race, vastly better to be born to die, than to live in this uncertain world. What parent would not prefer to lay all his children in an early grave, assured of their salvation, rather than expose them to the dreadful risks of life, and the possibility of eternal damnation? According to the current belief, those Chinese mothers who put their children to death make more Christians than all the missionaries."† It is certainly much more scriptural, and also more rational, to believe that children, like adults, die as they have lived; that they are not regenerated in passing through the article of death, much less wholly sanctified, but that the Lord provides for their

* Presbyterian and Reformed Review, April, 1890, p. 300.
† Magazine of Christian Literature, December, 1889, p. 113.

moral and spiritual wants in the intermediate world with the same care that He does in this, and that being truly human, they must necessarily there undergo a process of conscious, voluntary self-perfecting before they can attain unto positive holiness.

Whether faith can be properly predicated of infants or not is an old theological question which has been frequently discussed. Calvin and some of the other Reformers spoke of a *fides seminalis;* that is, a susceptibility, or natural aptitude of the soul in children for God. If that be incipient faith, then all men are believers by nature, because all are born with such a general attitude of unconscious receptiveness for Christ. But faith does not come by nature. It comes by grace. Neither will it relieve the case to distinguish faith into natural and Christian. The faith upon which baptism is given must have Christ for its object, and therefore is the beginning of Christian faith. But are not children baptized on the faith of those who present them for baptism? Most assuredly; and the faith of the parents or sponsors is substitutionary and accepted as such, in so far as the life of the child is bound up with, and conditioned by, the parents and the community life of the church.

But how can the faith of the parents be the medium for the reception and conveyance of that grace to the child, which can only be communicated to the faith of the individual for whom it is intended? No wonder that Luther, after he had vexed his soul in vain over this perplexing problem finally contented himself by saying in his Larger Catechism, "The matter does not depend on whether children have faith. Baptism is valid even when faith is wanting at the time of the baptism, and brings its blessings through the faith that emerges later."

Through baptism the compassionate Saviour, who so tenderly said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God," still receives and blesses every child that is brought to Him. The blessing bestowed is not an outward act simply, or a mere promise, but

an immediate and abiding reality to the spiritual nature of the subjects baptized. They are given to Christ and receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, according to Acts 2: 38, 39, "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him." But the sinful tendency of their corrupt nature remains, and the Holy Ghost does not work magically, but only according to the faith and prayers of the parents or sponsors. Through the faith of the parents the grace of the sacrament is operative in the children and works toward their regeneration, which is actually brought to pass when they begin to exercise faith in Christ for themselves. Regeneration and faith are simultaneous in their manifestation. Neither can be without the other. The presence of living faith proves that regeneration has taken place.

How early faith may be generated in the hearts of children it is difficult to say, but it may certainly begin with the first faint dawn of consciousness, provided the parents are true to their covenant vows. The Church, therefore, properly baptizes children in their earliest infancy, so that all her activities of intercession, nurture and instruction may be based, not on anything in children by nature, but entirely on the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. They are baptized in order that they may become regenerate. Whether they actually do, depends on how they are nurtured and receive the grace offered to them.

In the case of adults the process is essentially the same. Here too the word and the sacrament co-operate to produce regeneration. No adult ought to be baptized against his will, or simply to comply with the command of the Saviour, but neither can the Church demand indications of regeneration on the part of the candidate. Sorrow for sin and faith in Christ, or a conscious desire to be delivered from sin by the Lord Jesus Christ, is the scriptural requirement for the sacrament. Admission into the Church, through baptism, is not to be re-

garded as a sign of personal holiness already attained, but as an evidence that the individual realizes his condition by nature, believes in Christ as his Saviour and desires to be brought into closer union with Him. We receive the remission of our sins, are regenerated by the Holy Ghost and sanctified to be members of Christ, not apart from, but through the word and the sacrament. It is therefore a mistake to suppose that the ideal of adult baptism consists in the manifestation of unmistakable evidences of regeneration at the time of the administration of the sacrament. Such a theory implies that regeneration is not the effect of baptism, but that it takes place parallel with it, and not under its influence as a real means of grace.

Through the sacrament the individual enters into covenant with God and thus obtains a sure anchor for the faith, which the Holy Ghost works in his heart. The manifestation of this faith is an evidence of the presence of regeneration, which is an active, living principle, implanted into the soul, through the application of the grace of the sacrament and the preaching of the word. Through these means of grace, when properly used, the Holy Ghost secures the conditions required by the baptismal covenant, repentance, faith and obedience. Where these conditions exist, there there is spiritual life: regeneration has taken place.

But does it never occur without baptism? Is the sacrament so important as to be absolutely essential to salvation? The answer to this question depends altogether on whether we consider the subject in a narrow or in a comprehensive sense; whether we regard simply the form or the essence of baptism. If we first empty the sacrament of its spiritual contents, and look upon it simply as a ceremony, then certainly as such it is not essential to salvation. The Church, distinguishing essence and form, has always taught that the *baptismus flaminis*, or *sanguinis* (the baptism of desire, or of blood) may be a substitute for the *baptismus fluminis*, or ordinary baptism, and that it is not the want, but the contempt of the sacrament that condemns. "Still,"

says Dorner, "it must be held that every one, to be saved, must receive, either in this world or the next, that which constitutes the essence of baptism. How God will impart this depends on His own free choice, not on our caprice."* We are bound to His revealed will, and cannot be sure of our salvation, without a childlike submission to His ordinances, of which the sacrament of baptism is one.

We have been using the words regeneration and new-birth as synonymous. We have done this designedly. The Scriptures do not distinguish between begotten of God, regeneration and new-birth. Whatever separate ideas may by some persons be at times attached to these terms, the apostles imply that to be begotten of God or regenerated is the same as to be born again. The word regeneration (*παλιγγενεσία*) occurs only twice in the Scriptures—Titus 3: 5, "According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," and in Matt. 19: 28, "Ye which have followed me in the regeneration." But the various forms of *γεννάω*, of which, with the prefix *πάλιν*, *παλιγγενεσία* is one, constitute the usual Greek terms. The primary meaning of this verb is to beget; but that it cannot be thus restricted is evident from Matt. 2: 1, "Now when Jesus was born (*γεννηθέντος*) in Bethlehem;" Matt. 26: 24, "It had been good for that man if he not been born" (*ἐγεννήθη*); John 9: 2, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born (*γεννηθῇ*) blind?" Rom. 9: 11, For the children being not yet born (*γεννηθέντων*) it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger; and Luke 1: 57, "Now Elizabeth's full time was come that she should be delivered, and she brought forth (*ἐγέννησε*) a son."

These passages clearly prove that *γεννάω* cannot be limited in its signification to procreation, but usually includes also, the idea of birth. The same thing is true spiritually. The words translated born again, born of water and the Spirit, and begotten or born of God, in St. John's Gospel and Epistles, are always some

* System of Christian Doctrine, vol. iv. p. 293.

Hence no room for exercise of our powers in the act. God completes it — (over

form of γεννάω. See John 1: 13, "Which were born (ἐγεννήθησαν) not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John 3: 3, "Except a man be born again" (γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν); 3: 6, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit.' Here in both cases we have γεγεννημένον. 1 John 2: 29, "Every one that doeth righteousness is born," or as the Revised Version renders it, "is begotten (γεγέννηται) of him;" 1 John 3: 9, "Whosoever is born (or begotten) (γεγεννημένος) of God doth not commit sin."—See also 1 John 4: 7 and 5: 4. The same thing is true of St. Peter. In his first Epistle 1: 23, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by the Word of God," he uses the same word with the prefix ἀνά. St. James employs a term peculiar to himself, ἀποκυέω, signifying, to bring forth: "Of his own will He brought us forth (ἀπεκύησεν) with the word of truth." James 1: 18.

We believe, therefore, that the most comprehensive English term, that is, the word "birth," expresses most nearly what the writers of the New Testament wished to set forth in the spiritual sphere when they spoke of the great change which takes place when we become new creatures in Christ Jesus. They had before their minds not simply a possibility, nor merely the gracious relation in which we stand to Christ through our baptism, but an actual birth—a soul born of God and in living communion with Him.

Just when or how in any given instance, such personal life union with Jesus Christ is first established by the Holy Ghost, we may not be able to tell. But we know that our Lord honors the means of grace, and, by His Spirit, operates through their use, and that in the degree in which the offered grace is appropriated does it prove effectual in bringing about the change denominated in the Scriptures regeneration or the new birth.

This new birth, the Saviour tells us, is of a deeply mysterious character. He compares it to the wind, of which we cannot tell whence it cometh, or whither it goeth, at the same time

that its presence is plainly manifested by the effect which it produces. So the person in whom the great change of regeneration has been wrought does not understand whence the new impressions which he experiences proceed, nor whither they are leading him. He only knows that whereas he was spiritually dead, now he is alive; whereas he was blind, now he sees, but he cannot comprehend the transformation which he has undergone, any more than the beginning of his natural life. Our new life in Christ is not first of all, in its essence, an experience, else it were no mystery. It lies deeper than all conscious, sensible experience, but, as in the case of all other forms of life, it can be known only through its manifestations. These do not produce the life, but where it exists it must reveal itself; and our knowledge of its presence depends upon its manifestations.

What these are is clearly revealed in the Scriptures. This, however, is often overlooked, and great confusion arises, so that sometimes people are Christians without knowing it. The best evidence is at hand that they are in a state of grace, but their spiritual vision has been so distorted by false teachings, that they are in deep distress because they imagine they are not regenerate. It is therefore highly important that we should clearly understand what the word of God lays down as the marks of the new birth.

According to the Scriptures, in the soul in which the new birth has taken place we always find certain results, revealing the presence of spiritual life. The first of these, and the foundation of all the rest, as we have already intimated, is faith. Jesus speaks of faith in this way. He says (John 5:24), "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." To have passed from death unto life is to be born again. He that heareth Christ's word and believeth, passes out of death into life and so is born again. Hence we read in 1 John 5:1, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God,"

and again in John's Gospel 1:12–13, "As many as received Him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His Name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The faith here spoken of as an infallible mark of the new birth is not simply an intellectual or speculative belief; not a bare assent to the truths of the creed and the Bible. In that sense the devils believe and tremble, and many people living in Christian lands have a similarly dead faith. The true, living, Christian faith, which whosoever hath is born of God is a sure trust and confidence in Jesus as the Saviour, accompanied with sincere sorrow of heart for sin. This trust carries with it the consent of the will, involving unconditional surrender and implicit obedience. Thus we see how faith, generated through the means of grace, continually leads the believer back to them. If a man believes in Christ before he is baptized his faith at once demands the sacrament as an ordinance of the Saviour whom he has undertaken to follow. True faith never attempts to supersede or ignore the word and the sacraments, but finds its highest freedom and strongest confirmation in their use.

An immediate and constant fruit of this faith is power over sin. Christ not only renews, but also sanctifies the soul. Wherever His blood is applied He cleanseth the conscience from dead works and purifies the heart from unholy desires and passions. Hence St. John says (1 John 3:6), "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not." And again (1 John 5:18), "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not, but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself and the evil one toucheth him not." The regenerate life of the Christian is incompatible with sin. To the extent, therefore, that a believer commits sin he imperils his life communion with Christ, and casts doubt on the reality of his regeneration.

Another scriptural mark of regeneration and the greatest of all, is love to God and to our fellow-men. Of this love St. John says (1 John 4:7), "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God,

and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love." "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren. Hereby we know that we are of the truth and shall assure our hearts before Him."

The faith that works by love, producing the fruits of the Spirit and the various Christian graces, is the evidence that we are regenerate.

To conversion regeneration is related as cause to effect. The two terms are often confounded, but should be carefully distinguished. Conversion is the human act of turning from sin to God. It is possible only through the presence of regenerating grace in the heart. The same grace by means of which regeneration is effected also produces the godly sorrow which worketh repentance unto life. Both manifest their presence at the same time, but, whilst regeneration is the act of God, imparting life to the soul, conversion is the activity of the soul in turning, under the influence of this life, from sin to holiness.

Both are also to be distinguished from sanctification, which consists in the unfolding of the new life. As soon as this becomes active in the soul it awakens the opposition of the old Adamic life. Its development therefore involves a struggle, which varies according to the disposition, temperament, character, previous training and present environment of those who are under its influence. The history of every child of grace is that of a series of failures and successes, in the midst of which the Lord Jesus is ever present to forgive, to encourage, stimulate and strengthen, and thus to help forward the soul in holiness. An important means for the promotion of our sanctification is the Lord's Supper.

As to the question of God's sovereignty and man's free agency in bringing about the new birth, all theories which fail to do justice to both must be peremptorily set aside. One of the encouraging signs of the true trend of theological science at the present day, is the fact that the Christian consciousness rejects not only Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism and Arminianism, but also Absolute Predestination, so that creed revision has become an imperative necessity in the Presbyterian Church.

and again in John's Gospel 1:12–13, "As many as received Him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His Name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The faith here spoken of as an infallible mark of the new birth is not simply an intellectual or speculative belief; not a bare assent to the truths of the creed and the Bible. In that sense the devils believe and tremble, and many people living in Christian lands have a similarly dead faith. The true, living, Christian faith, which whosoever hath is born of God is a sure trust and confidence in Jesus as the Saviour, accompanied with sincere sorrow of heart for sin. This trust carries with it the consent of the will, involving unconditional surrender and implicit obedience. Thus we see how faith, generated through the means of grace, continually leads the believer back to them. If a man believes in Christ before he is baptized his faith at once demands the sacrament as an ordinance of the Saviour whom he has undertaken to follow. True faith never attempts to supersede or ignore the word and the sacraments, but finds its highest freedom and strongest confirmation in their use.

An immediate and constant fruit of this faith is power over sin. Christ not only renews, but also sanctifies the soul. Wherever His blood is applied He cleanseth the conscience from dead works and purifies the heart from unholy desires and passions. Hence St. John says (1 John 3:6), "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not." And again (1 John 5:18), "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not, but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself and the evil one toucheth him not." The regenerate life of the Christian is incompatible with sin. To the extent, therefore, that a believer commits sin he imperils his life communion with Christ, and casts doubt on the reality of his regeneration.

Another scriptural mark of regeneration and the greatest of all, is love to God and to our fellow-men. Of this love St. John says (1 John 4:7), "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God,

and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love." "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren. Hereby we know that we are of the truth and shall assure our hearts before Him."

The faith that works by love, producing the fruits of the Spirit and the various Christian graces, is the evidence that we are regenerate.

To conversion regeneration is related as cause to effect. The two terms are often confounded, but should be carefully distinguished. Conversion is the human act of turning from sin to God. It is possible only through the presence of regenerating grace in the heart. The same grace by means of which regeneration is effected also produces the godly sorrow which worketh repentance unto life. Both manifest their presence at the same time, but, whilst regeneration is the act of God, imparting life to the soul, conversion is the activity of the soul in turning, under the influence of this life, from sin to holiness.

Both are also to be distinguished from sanctification, which consists in the unfolding of the new life. As soon as this becomes active in the soul it awakens the opposition of the old Adamic life. Its development therefore involves a struggle, which varies according to the disposition, temperament, character, previous training and present environment of those who are under its influence. The history of every child of grace is that of a series of failures and successes, in the midst of which the Lord Jesus is ever present to forgive, to encourage, stimulate and strengthen, and thus to help forward the soul in holiness. An important means for the promotion of our sanctification is the Lord's Supper.

As to the question of God's sovereignty and man's free agency in bringing about the new birth, all theories which fail to do justice to both must be peremptorily set aside. One of the encouraging signs of the true trend of theological science at the present day, is the fact that the Christian consciousness rejects not only Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism and Arminianism, but also Absolute Predestination, so that creed revision has become an imperative necessity in the Presbyterian Church.

A continually increasing number of Christian people keenly realize that the Divine and human factors come together in such a manner in the work of regeneration, that whilst the power to accept the offered salvation all comes from God, the responsibility of accepting or rejecting the same rests altogether with man.

Three points in conclusion: First, To identify regeneration and baptism, is to fall into the error of the Jews, who claimed to be the children of God, because they were the circumcised descendants of Abraham. The Saviour showed them that to be the children of Abraham and of God, they must be like their ancestor and their Heavenly Father. He assured them that although they were the seed of Abraham, many of them were, nevertheless, of their father, the Devil. And St. Paul tells us that, "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." (Rom. viii: 14.) He also assures us that there are those who profess that they know God, but by their works deny Him, being abominable and disobedient and unto every good work reprobate. (Titus 1: 16.)

Second: To claim to be regenerate without baptism, is to be wise above what is written, and to undervalue the Church as a Divine institution, ordained of God, for man's salvation.

Third: During the Middle Ages the sacramental in religion was for centuries emphasized and developed until it had been carried to its utmost extreme. Great historic movements are always of slow growth and far-reaching in their consequences. When the reaction comes, it cannot expend itself until after it has reached the opposite extreme. So with the Bible and the experimental in religion. A reaction has set in in their favor, so that now they are emphasized, whilst the sacraments are undervalued and ignored. In this way we account for the popularity of unchurchly doctrines, and the rapid progress of low church congregations. The solution of the problem lies not in depreciating the word of God and experimental religion, but in properly recognizing the importance of the Church and the sacraments on the one hand, and the word of God and experimental religion on the other.

Reading, Pa.

IV.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE IN ITS RELATION TO SALVATION.

BY REV. JOHN M. TITZEL, D.D.

MAN lives and man dies. In death he disappears from the earth. Nevertheless, he has ever believed that death does not end all, and that, consequently, in dying, he does not become the nothing that he was "ere born to life and living woe." Though he has always regarded death as in itself an evil, yet he has ever been disposed to hope that through and beyond death in some way good would come to the brave, the pure and the true. These intimations of a "life beyond life," which have their origin in the deepest instincts of man's being, are in fullest harmony with the teachings of Divine revelation. According to the Sacred Scriptures, there are three distinct states of existence for all men excepting those who may be alive at the coming of the Son of Man in the glory of his Father with the holy angels, when he shall reward every man according to his works. These states are the present state in which the soul is united with a corruptible and mortal body, the state immediately following death, in which the soul exists consciously as a disembodied spirit, and the state which will begin with the resurrection of the dead and continue forever, and in which the soul will be possessed of a spiritual body, incorruptible and immortal. The second of these states is very properly called the intermediate state, as it really is such when considered with reference to the present state, and the final state of human existence.

The present state, as we all are aware, is one of continual change. Here nothing is absolutely fixed. Man's final destiny

is still within his own power. His character is not yet fully determined, but only in the process of formation. Life and death are set before him, and he is left to choose between them. Though by nature a sinner, and as such under the condemnation of the law of God, yet through faith in Christ he may become righteous and an heir of everlasting life. Only if he chooses to make himself guilty of eternal sin does he become irrevocably a son of perdition. The final state, on the contrary, will be, according to the Scriptures, a state of eternal fixedness. In it everything will be unchangeably determined from the very beginning. From the judgment of the last day, the ungodly, our blessed Lord himself declares, "shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." In these words it is very clearly implied that the moral character of both classes will continue forever the same, as a change of character would necessarily involve a change of condition. In this state there will, no doubt, be progress. This is indeed clearly implied in various passages of Scripture. This progress, however, will always be in the same direction, so that the unjust and filthy will be unjust and filthy still, and the righteous and holy will be righteous and holy still.

But how is it as regards these things in the intermediate state? Does the fixedness of the final state, or the changeableness of the present state, pertain to it? Will the judgment find men in the same spiritual condition in which death finds them, or will it be possible, in the interval between them, for the unrighteous man to become righteous, and thus prepare himself to share in the future blessedness of God's chosen people? This is a question which of late years has engaged considerable attention, and has, unnecessarily we think, caused no little *odium theologicum* to manifest itself. In the present paper we propose to consider briefly the various answers that have been given to this question, and to present our own views as regards it.

The question itself, it may be well to state here at the very outset, is not only a very difficult one, but one which it is utterly

impossible to answer with absolute certainty, inasmuch as the data for its complete solution are not within our reach. To some, perhaps, at first thought this may appear to be a questionable assertion; but careful consideration of the matter can scarcely fail to make its correctness apparent to every thoughtful mind. A very little change in man's physical condition, we all know, may very seriously affect his entire thinking and acting in the present life. A blow on the head may cause a genius to become a comparative idiot, and a slightly diseased condition of the brain may change a virtuous man into a libertine. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to suppose that the loss of the entire body may seriously affect the condition of our spirits. But how it actually does affect them it is not in the power of mere reason certainly to say, as we have no experience of what it is to live apart from the body, and any conjecture based on our present experience is consequently just as likely to be wrong as right. For all certain knowledge of the intermediate state, we are, accordingly, wholly dependent on divine revelation. But when we turn to the Scriptures, we find that they even give us very little information concerning it. Most of their teachings relate to our present duties, and to the final rewards of the righteous and of the unrighteous. Only incidentally do they refer to the condition of men between death and the resurrection of the dead. And the few references to the intermediate state which they do contain it is not by any means easy in all cases to bring into complete harmony, as is evident from the differences of opinion which are to be found among those who are equally devout and well-versed in the contents of the Word of God. Modesty in the discussion of this subject will therefore ever be a fitting virtue.

On the point more especially under consideration in this paper, the general judgment of the Church from its very beginning has been that the final destiny of men is determined in this life, and that the intermediate state is a state of blissful expectation on the part of the righteous, and of a certain fearful

looking for of judgment on the part of the unrighteous. This view is in full accord with the teaching of St. Paul in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, that "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." For Principal Brown has well said: "If it is on the deeds *done in the body* that the judgment is to be held, it follows that no change effected after men have left the body will be taken into account in fixing their final state." It is also in full accord with the representation of the condition of men after death, given by our Lord in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. The impassable gulf which separates the one from the other clearly implies that the final destiny of both is already fully determined. Were repentance and faith still possible on the part of the rich man, then must it also be possible for him to pass out of the sphere of torment over into Abraham's bosom. Moreover, the Scripture teaching concerning death also favors this view. Death, St. Paul tells us, is "the wages of sin," and in full harmony with this, St. James declares, that "sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." Accordingly death is not in itself a good, but an evil. It does not tend to improve the condition of men, but to make it worse. The state into which it ushers men, as regards fullness of life and activity, is a lower state of existence than that in which we now are. The Psalmist, praying to the Lord for deliverance from affliction, says: "In death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave (sheol) who shall give thee thanks?" In Ecclesiastes we are told that "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave (sheol)." Jesus, with reference to death, said while with men in the flesh, "the night cometh in which no man can work." And St. Paul writing of the blessed dead speaks of them as being "asleep." All this seems very clearly to indicate that the intermediate state is not a sphere in which any decisive work as regards salvation can be done, but rather a sphere of fearful or peaceful waiting, and of silent development of the seed sown during the preceding

life. Should any one feel like urging in opposition to this that St. Paul in one of his epistles declares that "to die is gain," we would reply that his words clearly indicate that it is such only in the case of those to whom it is Christ to live, and over whom, because of their union with Christ, death has no real power; and that even of those, including himself, he says: "we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." From these words it is very evident that he did not consider the state between death and the resurrection as one which in itself is at all desirable.

But notwithstanding what has just been said in favor of the view we are considering, it is not free from serious objections both on Scriptural and ethical grounds. If by the righteous are to be understood merely the faithful among the patriarchs and children of Israel and true believers connected with the Church of Christ, then it follows that the great mass of mankind are among the lost. But this seems in conflict with the statement of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, that "as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life;" and that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." How also can the loss of the great majority of men be reconciled with the power of God and the love of God? Dr. Martensen well says: "If there be a will supposed to exist in creation which continues to all eternity to fight against God, a barrier is supposed which the divine love can never overcome. The same is true of the assertion that in the end 'every knee shall bow at the name of Jesus,' merely because all shall be obliged to recognize His *power*. The revelation of power is thus made the fundamental teleologic aim, whereas, according to the doctrine of Christianity, the omnipotence of God finds its limiting principle in His love. But the power of love

attains its end only when every knee bows willingly to its sway, because it is *morally* irresistible. The conception of a revelation which is one of mere power, cannot easily be harmonized with the true idea of Christ's power, which is ever the redeeming and perfecting power of grace; neither can it be harmonized with the primary article of the Christian faith, 'I believe in God, the Father, Almighty;' for the *Fatherly power* is really the power of love, which by a series of attracting influences leads on creation willingly to its goal." If we seek to increase the number of the saved by adding to those mentioned, infants dying in infancy and such heathen as may be true to the light of nature, on the ground that at death they are at once made full partakers of the righteousness of Christ, as many Protestant divines of our own times are disposed to do, the objections urged against the view will still retain their force, while at the same time new difficulties will present themselves for solution. For such theory implies either that men can be saved without a knowledge of the Gospel, or that the Gospel may be made known to them in some other way than through the Church of Christ; both of which suppositions are, to say the least, contrary to the letter, if not the spirit of Apostolic teaching.

Another view which has been prevalent in the Church from a very early period in her history, but which has never found such general acceptance as the one just considered, is that of the universal redemption and restoration of all moral beings, so that God may be, in the fullest and widest sense, "all in all." According to this view the intermediate state, like the present state, is a state of training and discipline. Its privations and sufferings are all designed to lead those who are subject to them to see the error of their ways and to turn away from it, and they will finally succeed in inducing them to do so. This view, as is evident from what has already been said in regard to the objections which attach themselves to the preceding view, is not without some foundation and sanction in the language of Scripture. Not only does it seem to be implied in the words of

St. Paul already quoted, but also in the sermon of St. Peter as given in the Acts of the Apostles, in which he speaks of "times of restitution of all things;" and in other Scripture passages which will readily suggest themselves to every careful reader of the Word of God. It is also favored by speculation on Teleology and divine love. "If we reason from this principle," says Dr. Martensen, "we cannot conceive of the destiny of the world as being other than a kingdom of blessedness of which no human soul shall come short. The supposition that the destiny of the world, the realization of the kingdom of God will be equally attained if some, yea many, souls be lost, may easily be maintained from a pantheistic point of view, which demands nothing more than the attainment of the end in general and as a whole, and which concerns the kingdom only and not individuals, but from a Christian standpoint it is beset with many and great difficulties. It is very difficult for example, to harmonize the idea of the damnation of particular souls with our conception of the decree of divine love which embraces every single human soul; it is very difficult, to harmonize it with the principle of a special providence, which repeats in every single soul the teleology of the entire kingdom." But nevertheless it is not possible to explain away successfully and satisfactorily those passages of Scripture which unmistakably teach the doctrine of the eternal condemnation of the wicked. For that this is taught in Scripture, the best exegetes of every school are compelled to admit. Moreover, the doctrine of universal restoration meets with insuperable speculative difficulties when considered from the anthropological, psychological and ethical standpoints. "For," to quote once more from Dr. Martensen, "if man can by no means be made blessed by a process of nature, must it not be possible for the will to retain its obduracy, and forever to reject grace, and in this manner to elect its own damnation? If it be replied that this possibility of a progressive obduracy implies also a continual possibility of conversion—this is a rash inference. For our earthly life already bears witness to that awful and yet necessary law

according to which evil ever assumes a more unchangeable character in the individual who chooses it." It is in itself, moreover, a fact "of no small significance," as Dr. Van Oosterzee well observes, "that the Christian Church of all ages has decidedly rejected the doctrine of the Apokatastasis, even when it was presented to her in the most charming colors."

The theory of Conditional Immortality, by which it has been sought to obviate some of the difficulties to which attention has been called, and according to which only those who are made new creatures in Christ Jesus will live forever, and all others finally pass entirely out of existence, has no special bearing on the intermediate state. It calls therefore for no particular consideration in this paper. It may not be out of place here, however, to state that according to our judgment this theory has no real sanction whatever in the teachings of God's word, but rests on a misinterpretation of Scripture terms, and especially on the confounding of life and death, with existence and non-existence; and that it leaves just as many difficulties unsolved as the other theories which have claimed our attention.

The view formally maintained by the Thnetopsychitæ, and which still finds advocates, that the soul at death becomes wholly unconscious and continues to be so until the resurrection of the last day, and the opinion held by still others that the resurrection takes place immediately after death, also require but a mere passing notice. For the first of these views makes the intermediate state a condition of utter oblivion and consequently a state in which no ethical or spiritual movement of any kind can take place; and the latter does away with an intermediate state altogether. Neither view has in our opinion any real foundation in Scripture. On the contrary, we believe both, like the preceding view of conditional immortality, to be irreconcilable with some of the most explicit teachings of our blessed Lord and His inspired Apostles. In reality these views are rather the product of philosophical speculation than of a careful, reverent and thorough study of God's word.

There is, however, still another theory which is becoming more and more generally accepted, which demands our consideration, as it bears directly on the subject with which this paper is concerned. This theory has been styled by Archdeacon Farrar "Eternal Hope," and by others has been designated "Future Probation." According to it the Gospel of Christ will be presented to all men before the final judgment, if not in this world then in the intermediate state, and upon the conscious and free acceptance or rejection of Christ, as thus presented, will depend the eternal condition of every child of man. Just in what particular way Christ will be presented in the intermediate state is not claimed to be known, but it is claimed that it will be in such a way as will enable all to choose for themselves between life and death. This it is maintained is necessary that the ways of God with men may be equal and His dealings with them be properly justified. It is also maintained that this view is in fullest harmony with the Scriptures which proclaim the fullness and freeness of salvation and God's readiness to forgive sin, set forth unbelief, or rejection of Christ as the only ground of human condemnation, imply the forgiveness of sin in the world to come (Matt. 12 : 32) and reveal the fact that the Gospel was proclaimed by Christ Himself to the dead. (1 Peter 3 : 19, 4 : 6.)

Though this view has the merit of very strongly emphasizing the necessity of faith in the incarnate Son of God in order to salvation, and is possessed of other very important elements of truth, yet it has met with violent opposition on the part of many, and has been pronounced both unscriptural and dangerously misleading. Especially has it been charged with a tendency to paralyze the great and important work of missions among the heathen, and to make men in this life indifferent to the means of grace. This charge we, however, believe to be groundless. Only when the whole conception of religion is a false one, in that it makes the salvation and happiness of the soul in the world to come its entire object, could this possibly be the case. And even with such a wrong concep-

tion of the nature and purpose of religion, we cannot see how it could interfere more with the work of missions than the view advocated by its opponents, according to which the salvation of the heathen is really possible without any knowledge of the historical Christ. This latter view we for our part would be disposed to consider under the circumstances the more mischievous of the two. When, however, it is properly realized, as it ever should be, that the chief object of the religion of Christ is to glorify God, and that it is designed to advance and promote the interests of men in this world as well as in the world to come, we think neither view will be likely to interfere with either the work of missions or the development of individual piety. For we are convinced that the false idea that religion does not in any real way benefit men in this world but will do so only in the world beyond the grave, is the chief cause of their indifference to its claims on their immediate attention.

A more serious objection to the doctrine we find in its robbing death of all real significance as a crisis in human existence, and in its making the intermediate state too much a mere continuation of the present state. Death, according to the Scriptures, is certainly something more than a mere change from one sphere of existence into another in all essential respects like that which preceded it. Were this all that it is, St. James would hardly have written, "Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death," or the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." The latter words, especially when considered in the connection in which they occur, imply that death is a decisive crisis in the existence of men. Moreover, it is also contrary to experience and analogy that the same power of determining life and character which belongs to one state of existence should pertain also to a quite different state. The physical and mental changes possible in the earlier stages of development we find always impossible in the later stages.

As regards the ethical considerations on which the doctrine

is based, we do not consider them at all valid. That men must have a true knowledge of the historical Christ in order to complete salvation we hold to be a truth which, if properly understood, is unquestionable. But we do not believe that such knowledge is necessary to the determination of character. The least knowledge of Christ may suffice for this purpose. Our Lord Himself clearly indicates as much in the words: "He that is faithful in the least is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much." Now as all truth is a revelation of Christ, we believe that the truth which the light of nature affords men is sufficient to determine their relation to Christ as friend or foe. Mark, sufficient simply to determine their relation to Christ and entitle them to be admitted among His chosen ones, and not to make them actual possessors of the blessings of salvation, which is a different thing and requires different conditions.

Of the passages of Scripture on which the advocates of this theory rely to prove its correctness none can be said to be conclusively in its favor. Only three of the passages, indeed, give any clearly apparent ground for the view maintained. These are Matt. 12:32, in which our Lord declares that "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come;" 1 Pet. 3: 19, in which the chiefest of the Apostles states that our Lord "preached unto the spirits in prison;" and 1 Peter 4:6, in which we are informed that "for this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." As regards the first of these Scripture passages we believe that it really implies that there is forgiveness of sin in the other world. It is a well-established fact that in the times of Christ prayers were offered for the dead, and that it was believed among the Jews that sins could be forgiven after death. Those addressed by Jesus when he uttered these words would therefore naturally understand them as in harmony with the view current among them. If, however, their view

was altogether false, it is inconceivable that Jesus would have used language that implied its correctness. But the doctrine that there is forgiveness in the other world does not by any means necessarily prove that men can in that world determine their final destiny. For this forgiveness may be limited to the sins of ignorance and infirmity of those who have already been accepted as worthy of being heirs of eternal life. And that such forgiveness is granted in the other world seems clearly involved in the Scripture teaching that here none attain to actual sinlessness and that yet such sinlessness is necessary to admittance into the state of final glory. As to the other two passages given above, they just as clearly imply that the Gospel is preached in the intermediate state. No one who will carefully examine them in the the original Greek, and guard himself against being influenced in his judgment by dogmatic prejudice, can fail to be convinced that this is their natural and legitimate import. But the Gospel is as necessary for the edification and proper development of those who belong to Christ as it is for the conversion of sinners. The fact that the Gospel is preached in the intermediate state does not accordingly in itself prove that this state is one in which a complete change of character may be effected. Among the church fathers of the first centuries of our era the opinion did prevail that Christ did preach to those in prison in the unseen world, but that this preaching brought joy and blessedness only to those who were awaiting His coming; and in this we believe they were right. Neither of the passages under consideration, therefore, do we believe, affords any proof that men can determine their final destiny after death has laid his cold, icy hand upon them.

Our own conviction, after a very careful and extensive study of the whole subject, is that the Scriptures decidedly favor the view that the condition in which men leave this world decides their place and condition in the eternal world. In the intermediate state it will no longer be possible for men to choose between life and death. Immediately after death there will be a

separation between the righteous and the unrighteous, which will be the prelude of their eternal separation. This we believe not only to be taught in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, but also by psychological considerations of a conclusive character. Like naturally and invariably seeks like. In this world, however, the law of affinity is interfered with by the fact that the body acts as a mask to the soul. Hence it is impossible for us always to discover our true affinities and to arrange ourselves into corresponding classes; so that here there is unavoidably a mixed condition of life. But at death, in the laying aside of the body, the spirit will be unmasked and its true character at once be discernible. This must necessarily lead to a division, between the different sections of which an impassable gulf will inevitably exist. All this, moreover, is in harmony with ethical requirements. All the knowledge that men actually need for the determination of their relation to God they possess in this life, even in the darkest regions of heathendom. "Because," as St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, with his usual intellectual acuteness, points out, "that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse."

But though the final destiny of men is determined in this life, yet in death the salvation of those who are received into the company of God's chosen people, is not at once made actually complete. They still continue more or less subject to the consequences of their transgressions, and, therefore, in need of deliverance and perfection. Full salvation will only be theirs when all the effects of sin are removed and their whole being, spiritual, moral, intellectual and physical, is restored to completeness and changed into the likeness of the glorified Christ, which it will not be before the resurrection of the last day, which will terminate the intermediate state. During the entire existence of this state there must, therefore, be going on

in it, a spiritual and ethical process of salvation. For we cannot conceive of man's being perfected in any other way. To suppose that God, by a mere act of His own will, without any regard to the will of man, could make him perfect involves the absurdity of making God a mere juggler. In order to his salvation there must be, on the part of man, an actual and adequate perception, and a free appropriation of the truth as truth is in Jesus. Without a knowledge of the historic Christ there can be no true knowledge of God, no complete redemption from the power of sin and death. This is clearly taught by our Lord Himself in the words: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." It is also implied in the words of our Lord: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." For how can men be drawn to Him by His lifting up, that is, by His death upon the Cross, unless they have knowledge of His crucifixion and ascension?

The so-called New Theology is therefore right in maintaining the necessity of a knowledge of the historic Christ in order to salvation, and its opponents who would put the ideal Christ in the place of the historic Christ are wrong, inasmuch as the former becomes real for men only in the latter. This theology is also right in maintaining that the Gospel is presented to men in the intermediate state. This must be evident to all who will carefully consider what has already been stated. For if none are perfect on entering the intermediate state, and if all must be made perfect before they can enter the final state of glory, and if the required perfection can only be attained through a knowledge of the truth brought to light by the incarnate Christ, then this truth must in some way be made known to them, if perfection, or what is the same thing, actual and complete salvation, is ever to be theirs. Then no supposition is more reasonable than that the Gospel has been, is, and will continue to be proclaimed among the dead. Can we conceive of the Apostles and fathers of the early Church, and the hosts of Christians who have entered the spirit-world during the last

eighteen hundred years, remaining silent there concerning the Saviour and those great truths which here engaged their attention and were the source of their chief joy? No, but we are compelled to believe that their chief employment there is rehearsing the ever-attractive and soul-inspiring story of the Cross, and seeking more and more to penetrate its profound mysteries of love and wisdom. So, also, we cannot but believe that the enemies of Christ in the unseen world are engaged in ridiculing and reviling the blessed Saviour and His work, just as they were wont to do here, and of so proclaiming Him and His glorious deeds to all associated with them in suffering the torments of Hades.

Should the question here arise, Why, if the Gospel is proclaimed throughout all the regions of the dead, may not men there accept it as well as reject it, and reject it as well as accept it, as is the case in this world? we answer, Because their character has already been determined, and, moreover, because their environment there is altogether different from what it is here. There the good are surrounded only by the good, and the evil by the evil, while here men's surroundings are of a mixed character. The significance of this fact can scarcely be overestimated. In the development of all things and beings, material, vital and spiritual, environment plays a most important part. "Evil communications," the Apostle Paul reminds us, "corrupt good manners." So he also informs us that "the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the (believing) wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother." Ten righteous persons would have saved the cities of the plain, but their absence doomed them to a terrible destruction.

But it may also be asked, How about infants dying in infancy? Can their character be said in any sense to be determined here? In reply we would say it can be and is. It is a mistake to suppose that they do not exercise will power, and that complete knowledge of any kind is necessary to give a bias to the will. The child does will from the moment it enters into this world, and there is always a cause for its will-

ing as it does, though this cause may not be clearly before it in consciousness. But it may further be asked, Will they be found among the saved, or will some also be among the lost? We are disposed to believe that the common sentiment of enlightened and humane hearts, that they will be saved, is correct. Their salvation, however, is by no means due to their complete innocence. They, as well as others, are all by nature involved in the corruption of the race to which they belong. But the corruption, or disposition to evil in them, not having been strengthened or confirmed by the evil influence of their environment, and the evil determinations of their own will, is such as may be overcome by the presence of the good, which is able to draw them in virtue of its superior power. That true goodness does attract them is clearly implied in such sayings as these which are the common property of mankind: "Whom the gods love die early," "Children are always disposed to go to the good rather than to the bad," "It is a good sign when children are fond of any one"; and in the words of our Lord: "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God." When, therefore, infants die, and are confronted, as they necessarily must be, by those who are in the spirit-world, there is every reason to believe that they are attracted not by the evil spirits, but by the good, who accordingly take them to their own place, and that in this way they, as well as all others in heathen lands who have in any way been drawn toward the good, are, as it were, regenerated by being delivered at death from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son, where they will be trained and fitted for everlasting glory. The early death of infants is not, however, for this reason to be accounted any special gain to them. For though they are saved, yet there are valid grounds for believing that they will forever be comparatively infants, and on this account occupy a lower position in the eternal world than those who have attained the crown of everlasting life through tribulation and suffering for Christ's sake in the present evil world.

The intermediate state in its relation to salvation is accordingly not a state of beginnings, but of endings. It is not a state in which men are first brought into relation with God, but one in which the relations begun previously are perfectly consummated. It is so to speak the chrysalis state of human existence in which God's chosen ones are transformed from the earthly into the Heavenly, and thus made like unto the glorified Christ.

This view we believe to be in substantial accord with that of all past ages, and to us this is a strong confirmation of its correctness. The true can never be the altogether new. It must ever have its roots in the beginning of things. In the form in which we have presented this view, we believe, moreover, light is cast upon some of the perplexing points of the subject under consideration. We do not, however, claim to have solved all the difficulties connected with it. Now we see through a glass darkly, and know only in part, and he who imagines that he can solve all mysteries, only shows that he has as yet failed to learn the limitations of his own powers, and is still ignorant of himself.

The view presented, we would yet say in conclusion, leaves to the present life all its importance and solemnity. Now we are determining our future, spinning the threads of life which will be the warp and woof of our final destiny. Here we are all painting for eternity; and whether the result of our labors will be "a thing of beauty" and "a joy forever," worthy a place in the Heavenly mansion, or a miserable daub, fit only to be cast out into outer darkness, depends wholly on how we are using the brush and applying the colors which God has given us in our mental, moral and spiritual endowments and in the circumstances in which He has placed us. In this life we are sowing what we shall reap after death. "Their works do follow them."

V.

SIMON BAR-JONA: THE STONE AND THE ROCK.

"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

CHAPTER II.—*Concluded.*

A PECULIAR STONE.

"Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee."—St. Matt. xvi. 17.

SECTION V.

The Baptism of John.

THAT God's life was communicable could not be imagined under the old economy. There it was held, and rightly, to be incommunicable. The error, however, was in supposing it to be so in its nature, whereas it was only so under that dispensation. It could not be given to man sinful, except through man sinless; and to this end had been the simultaneous creation of Jesus and incarnation of the eternal Son. Therefore John, the forerunner, was further ignorant of what that baptizing with the Holy Ghost would really be, which he proclaimed of the Christ, in such strong contrast with his own, by the words: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." The "water" was "unto repentance," but unto what was "the Holy Ghost?" John could not say. It was merely his to declare that another baptizing should take place, and be the special and sole prerogative of the Messiah, but what would be the result of it belonged to the future. He, too, saw "through a glass darkly," * and knew but "in part."

Another proof that this coming of the Holy Ghost was

* R. V. "In a mirror," I Cor. xiii. 12.

peculiar, unknown to John and his baptism, lies in the fact that his disciples were re-baptized when they were taken into the Christian church. Many of the Jews, who, on the Day of Pentecost, cried: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" no doubt owed the distressing conviction that in Jesus of Nazareth they had crucified their Messiah, as much to the awakening Spirit of John's baptism—latent in them, but now thoroughly roused—as to Peter's preaching, and yet all these, the apostle, also moved by the Spirit, "commanded to be baptized" (again with water) in order, as he said, that they might "receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Doubtless, too, among the three thousand converts of that day were many who had received from the disciples of Jesus a baptism of water which had also, like John's, for its object such an awakening of the sinner as would result in "repentance" and faith in Christ as a Saviour when He should thus be publicly declared; and yet all these, too, St. Peter commanded to be re-baptized. And those "twelve certain disciples," or believers, whom St. Paul found at Ephesus, and who had "not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost," though they had been baptized "unto John's baptism," this apostle likewise commanded to be re-baptized. Why? Because not in any of these cases had it been Christian baptism. It had not been "In," or "Into" * (as it really is) "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." It had not been in the name of the Trinity, as Jesus, after His resurrection, formulated it for the apostles. Though the Baptist was acquainted with the terms "Father," "Son," and "Holy Ghost," they were hardly associated in his mind as a coequal trinity. He could not know this doctrine. It is strictly Christian, and Christ was the first to teach it; for only the incarnate Son could truly reveal the Father and the Spirit, and the revelation was not made before John's death. Neither had his baptism, in any of the instances cited, been in that Name which is equal to all of these, "the Name of the Lord Jesus," in whom

* New Test. Comm. and R. V. Matt. xxviii. 19.

"dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," because as LORD or Jehovah, Jesus, at the time of John's and His own disciples' baptizing, had not yet been revealed nor declared.

Christian baptism cannot be given, through the ministration of men, in any other way than by the visible application of water. It is never knowingly repeated. It brings, *in the germ*, all that can be developed in man here and hereafter. It will never be superseded by any other, nor discontinued till Christ comes to render it unnecessary, and without it no one can be saved. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he *can not* enter into the kingdom of God." By what, then, is it constituted? Or, to develop it more fully: What is meant by "the Holy Ghost," which John said the Messiah should "baptize with?" And what is that "Gift" which St. Peter, the new Baptist, after his convicting sermon at Pentecost, promised to all who would become its subjects, in the words: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins?" Is not this enough? Not at all, for he adds: "and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost."

SECTION VI.

"The Holy Ghost."

First, and negatively, by the Holy Ghost of Christian baptism is meant not alone that awakening energy, that convicting and illuminating Spirit of the Old Testament, as He comes bearing life's herald and promise—"light;" light to waken men and show them their sins and their Saviour. That was the office of John's baptism, and still is, since his has been joined to Christ's in the words: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of *water* and the Spirit, he can not enter the kingdom of God." Nor, since it is He who cometh without observation, is it the Spirit as at Pentecost He suddenly descended on the apostles and many more believers, "about an hundred and twenty," men and women, old and young, who "were all with one accord in one place,"

"and there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire" (perhaps rays of light diverging from a common centre), "and it sat upon each of them: and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." This was a fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy:" or testify and teach, which is the first and continuous privilege of every believer. The gift of tongues, however, was limited to the early church, and, being merely for a sign, it "vanished away."

Besides, this "like gift" with the apostles and brethren, the Gentiles, some time after, at Peter's visit to Cornelius, and in the midst of the former's preaching, also received. And they not only obtained it without baptism of any kind, but even though uncircumcised, so that "they of the circumcision were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the Gift of the Holy Ghost." *Which* gift? The gifts of the Spirit are many and manifold. The answer is: "For they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God." "Then Peter answered, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord." By the expression, "which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we," the apostle meant that the Spirit had manifested Himself in the Gentiles after the same fashion as He did in the Jews; that is, by enabling them to pray and praise God, and declare the glad tidings of salvation, or "wonderful works of God" in various languages. This was likewise typical of the conversion of, or rather, spread of the gospel over the whole world, agreeably to the prophecy of Joel: "I will pour out

my Spirit on all flesh." At least, St. Peter, quoting the prophecy at Pentecost, so interpreted and applied that many-voiced and eloquent descent of the Spirit.

If His coming in this impetuous and public manner, had been that peculiar promise of the Holy Ghost and His great gift, which all believers, without distinction, and "to the end of the world," were to receive at their baptism—Why did Peter command his Gentile hearers to be baptized? Having these already, baptism in their case would be superfluous. Or, if it had been the Spirit and His gift obtained invisibly, why subject them to the visible ordinance? Merely to mark them as members of the Christian Church? Not so. They were baptized because, first (and this they were to learn), the sudden and miraculous power to pray, and praise, and prophesy in unknown tongues, was neither the evidence of the abiding presence of the Holy Ghost, nor of His highest gift; and second, because both of these were only promised on the visible application of water—"Repent and be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and" (then) "ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost:" or, to enlarge and make it clearer,—then ye shall receive the Holy Ghost, who is Himself a gift, and with Him the one universal and wonderful Gift, which to the end of the world He brings to all submissive and believing men.

The Spirit's gift of tongues, accompanied with fire, descending on the apostles and Peter as their chief, was doubtless the sign and seal of their commission as inspired preachers, and the fulfilment of their Master's promise that they who had been with Him "from the beginning" of His ministry should be enlightened "by the Spirit of Truth." Moreover, it empowered them, publicly and distinctively, to convey through preaching, and baptism, and "the laying on of hands," the Holy Ghost with His great and many of His minor gifts to others. And, therefore, "the eleven" stood up with Peter while he raised his voice, and, in the name of them all, made calmly and clearly his wonderful exposition and speech and

promise, for now was fulfilled to them the words that they should "be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," and by this coming of His "be endued with power from on high."

To the disciples and brethren, on whom the gift of tongues descended, likewise accompanied with fire, it was also "a sign of gifts of utterance," "of knowledge and spiritual insight," that they should be taught when, and what, and how to speak, and no doubt, too, of great zeal and fervor in the cause of the Lord. But this gift, unaccompanied with fire, and descending after Pentecost, in the presence of Peter and the brethren, on the Gentiles with Cornelius at their head as representatives of the heathen nations, was only to show and convince the former that the Gentiles were fellow-heirs with the Jews of salvation; and typical perhaps of the like destiny of the Romans to carry, later, the gospel to remoter heathen. To the Gentiles themselves it was a token of admission from God, the Saviour, to the privileges of His gospel; a fulfilment of His promise, "I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest to them that asked not after me." To the Jews, it was a sign that the Gentiles could be saved by baptism without first becoming members of the covenant of circumcision: was an intimation that they must receive baptism, not that they had it already (invisibly), nor its benefits without it; and as such the brethren understood it, and St. Peter, irresistibly led, "commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord." Had those extraordinary manifestations, miracles included, been the result of that wonderful Gift of the Holy Ghost which was to distinguish the Christian above the Jewish and all other religions, they would have continued to this day in the church and marked every one of its members. That they do not, proves they were only for a temporary purpose, and destined to depart as suddenly as they came. That purpose served, like all lesser gifts, "they failed." They were a sign that their subjects could be regenerated, not a seal that they were,; and if not followed by the visible baptism of

water when the opportunity offered, these would, after their withdrawal, have fallen back to their former state, for Peter had been sent equally to instruct and to baptize.

What then, positively, is meant here by "the Holy Ghost," and what is that greatest "gift" of His which comes with Christian baptism in the Name of the Trinity, (as this was then implied "in the Name of the Lord," or, "of the Lord Jesus," or, as it is in some of the older copies, "of the Lord Jesus Christ"), and both of which, Spirit and gift, "abide" in the ordinances of His church forever, and were prompted by God's "love," and love alone?

SECTION VII.

The Holy Ghost and His Gift.

By the former is meant here, more particularly, the Spirit of God, as, under the new dispensation, He proceeds from the Father and the Son, as the latter is incarnate in the Messiah. Both the Father and the Spirit, though not incarnate like the Son, are ever one with Him because of their indivisible and essential unity. Therefore, in Christ is said to dwell "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." As the Spirit is thus one with, and inseparable from Jesus Christ and the LORD incarnate in Him, He enters the believer. Hence the Scriptures say at times that "Christ" is in the Christian; and at others, "the Spirit of Christ;" and at others, "the Holy Ghost." Under the old dispensation, the Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son as the latter was *un*incarnate. Under the new, He proceeds from them as the Son is *in*carnate. Under the old, His work was the natural and supernatural creation of unfallen man, out of matter already made by God. Under the new, it is the sinless re-creation or re-generation, or re-newing, or restoring of fallen man: and in all these acts He is, in new and old, spoken of as the Breath of God. "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." "And He *breathed*

on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

Moreover, under the new, He is represented to be what He never was under the old, the Giver of the life of God. Man, in the beginning, was made by the Spirit of God as He is the giver of breath, or created and mortal human life, in order that —should he stand—he might be generated by the Spirit as He is also the giver of uncreated and immortal human life. But man fell; and to save him from further calamity, and restore him to his original position of sinless mortality, and so give him another trial, the work of his creation had to be done over. This re-creation or re-newing takes place under the new dispensation. It is the first act in the history of its subjects, and hence the birth of Jesus, the second Father of man, is its first record, though He was really born (and consequently His people are) under the old dispensation, as it and the succeeding interlap each other and cannot be divided. The New Testament is as much a history of the generations of God's life, as the Genesis of the Old is a history of the creations of His breath. However, the new covenant is further marked above the old by an immeasurable advance. The life of God, which, under the old, was to be given to man at the end of his probation, should it prove successful, is, under the new, given to him at the beginning of his second trial; for man had now not only to stand, but to be recovered from a deadly fall. His re-creation by God's breath, and generation by His life, is one act; though in man the life is only latent under the breath, and represented mortal as it, because dependent on it for its preservation and development. The Jews "slew Jesus of Nazareth," but at the same time they "killed the Prince of Life," "and crucified the Lord of Glory." And the Spirit under this form, or thus proceeding *from* the Father and the Son, and also *through* the Son as the latter is incarnate in the created Messiah, enters into the subject of regeneration, and enables him to recognize the Christ as perfect man and perfect God in one person, sinless and holy by

nature, and himself as sinful, undone and lost forever. Further, at this crisis He reveals the former to be a perfect Saviour, Mediator and Redeemer; and then if the subject cherishes Him and His work, his own sanctification is gradually and finally achieved, and with it the complete redemption of all that he lost, potentially as well as actually, by the fall of Adam, his first representative and father.

But pre-eminently, the Holy Ghost of Christian baptism is the Spirit of God as coming not only from, but through and with man's Redeemer, He is characterized by all the acts of the latter's life, chiefly His birth, death, resurrection, ascension and glorification. This peculiar marking, belonging both to Christ and the Spirit, it is evident could only begin with the Messiah's conception and incarnation. Hence St. John, speaking "of the Spirit which they that believe on Him should receive" (in the future, at Pentecost), says, "for the Holy Ghost was not yet" ("*given*" is interpolated), "because that Jesus was not yet glorified." In other words, the living mould through which He was to come to men was then only in process, and would not be perfected till Jesus was glorified and the historical Christ so far completed. And, therefore, the Holy Ghost, at the time St. John speaks of, was not only "not yet *given*," but He really was "not yet," or after this perfect manner prepared for men. How then could the Baptist know this *form* of the Holy Ghost, or even the disciples who sat at Jesus' feet know it, or Jesus Himself be able to give it, except *in part?* As little as men could be generated of the last Adam before He was in existence, and of the eternal Son before He was incarnate! All the remaining acts of the Messiah's life were to be passed through, and His seat taken at the right hand of power, before the Spirit, who should "not speak of Himself," could be sent into their hearts to take of the things of Christ and show them unto them, and "guide them into all truth." This characterization of Him, or of the life which He was to bring, makes Him the very Spirit of Christ, so inseparable from Christ, that they are

spoken of as identical—"the Lord is that Spirit"—and yet they must not be confounded.

Indeed, "Father, Son and Holy Ghost" (according to the baptismal formula) are all represented as coming to and dwelling in the believer. "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him," showing that the whole Trinity, by reason of their inseparableness, enters man for the complete redemption of his being, as he was made in the image of God as He is One Being as well as Three Persons or "subsistences." This unity or oneness of man may be his single and undying self-consciousness (called likewise his SOUL or SPIRIT), out of which one living breath or principle probably spring the three living breaths or principles, each, of his "spirit, and soul, and body," and into which, perhaps, at death they retire, and he returns "naked" to his Maker; for the LORD God, or Jehovah God, is also and always the One and only "living" or self-conscious or personal God. Hence man's regeneration takes place, whether he knows it or not, in the very centre of his being, his self-consciousness, that which constitutes his one single personality.*

The Holy Ghost, then, of Christian baptism, who is always present with the Lord, is Himself a gift, purchased for man by his Redeemer at the cost of all that He endured from His coming to earth till His return to heaven. But the surpassing Gift which He, who is "the Lord and Giver of life," must needs bring to man, coming so inseparable from the incarnate Son, is the whole *human*† life, created and uncreated, of Jesus Christ the LORD. Christ's LIFE, therefore, is that peculiar

* "Personality is constituted by self-consciousness." Nevin's "Mystical Presence," note on page 169.

† "Christ is personally present always in the church. This, of course, in the power of his divine nature. But his divine nature is, at the same time, *human*" [this word is *Italicised* in the original], "in the fullest sense; and wherever his presence is revealed in the church in a real way, it includes his person necessarily under the one aspect as well as under the other."—Nevin's "Mystical Presence," p. 174.

and universal "Gift" of the Spirit which St. Peter, as the mouth of the Lord, offered, at Pentecost, on condition of repentance and baptism, not only to the unbaptized, but to those of the circumcised, who, already convicted of sin through their latent baptism of John, were now "pricked in their hearts," or completely roused by Peter's preaching to a sense of their guilty and lost condition. However, even Christ's life could avail the subject little, for it holds only "in the presence and power of the Holy Ghost;" * and as He and His work are inseparable, both can be neglected, rejected, denied, "quenched" on man's side and withdrawn on God's. The life He brings is only potentially and conditionally the subject's, and not his very own till he makes it such by laboring—his spirit with Christ's Spirit—to bring about the grand object of his regeneration, that of which the latter is only the beginning, his *conversion*, and, eventually, his full birth of the inseparable last Adam and incarnate LORD. "When thou art converted (that is when thou art controlled by the spiritual life within thee, and art intelligently working with the Holy Ghost to promote its growth), "strengthen thy brethren," Jesus said to Peter. Prior to this St. Peter and his brethren had received regeneration, which is an instantaneous act on the part of the Spirit, and mostly unconscious in the receiver, whereas conversion is the subject's individual self-determination to allow and assist, with God's help, and come what may, the new life to prevail. Hence, it results in his sanctification, or the growth, under the old, of the new man, which, weakened by its conflicts, is, through the indwelling of the Spirit, "renewed," "day by day," with fresh supplies of this same spiritual life

Thus is reached the solution that while John's baptizing with water was "unto repentance," Christ's baptizing "with the Holy Ghost" was to be unto life everlasting and eternal. And thus too is disclosed the crowning object of the Messiah's receiving of these two baptisms—that, by the applica-

* "Mystical Presence," page 175.

tion of them to men, He might, through the agency of the Holy Ghost, act on their life with every phase of His own. For "Except a man be born of water and (of the *) Spirit," of the last Adam and incarnate LORD, he can neither "see" nor "enter into the (invisible) kingdom of God." And, therefore, though the baptismal formula of the visible kingdom is now, according to Christ's command, in the Name of the Trinity, yet at its opening, when he was publicly declared to be "both LORD and Messiah," men were only baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ as He is the LORD, because that one Name, "LORD," or "JEHOVAH," is equal to all the names united of the Persons Three, distinct and yet inseparable. The Name of Christ embraces His whole personality, as He is "both" created and uncreated, man and God; and hence Christians are said to have been baptized "into Christ," to have "put on Christ," to be "in Christ," and "Christ in them," to be "dead in Christ," and to be "risen with Him." Whatever He is and does, they are said to be and do, because they partake of His life.† By this partaking they are forever "one" with Him, as the vine and branches are one in having a common life. But He, the True Vine, and they, the branches, have personality; and therefore in the preservation of His and their individual identity, they are said (what is never said of a vine and its branches) to be "*born*" of Him. And yet in having this life only *in* Christ, and so long as they "abide" in Him, or His Spirit and Life remains in them, they are also said to be but "*begotten*" of Him. "*I* live; yet not *I*, but *Christ* liveth in *me*." The personality of each is always preserved, though the sons of the last Adam are so different from the sons of the first, that the severing from the parent-stem, which is life to these, would be death to those. The

* *Omit* "of the." Lange's Comm., St. John iii. 5.

† "In both cases" (Adam and Christ) "it is a representative and *vital* union. We are in Adam because He was our head and representative, and because we *partake of his nature*. And we are in Christ because he is our head and representative, and because we *partake of his nature*" [the *Italicising* is ours] "through the indwelling of his Spirit."—Hodge's Comm. on 1 Cor. xv. 22.

fullness and the beginning of their new life is to be found alone in Him: and only "Christians" complete are they in being thus the sons of Christ's person and life, the "members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones," as well as the professors of and believers in His doctrines and works.

SECTION VIII.

Official Value of the Messiah's Baptism Illustrated.

The baptizing of the Messiah was doubtless intended to be His forerunner's closing, as it was his crowning act. Of a surety, after that, his power and presence among the Jewish people declined, and the prediction that he must decrease while Christ increased was fulfilled. He had signified the advent of the Kingdom of God by the consecration of its King, had inaugurated the introduction of the Christian church into the world by the baptism with water of its sacred Head, and henceforth, as far as regards the old dispensation, John the Baptist's work was done. At the time of his disciples' visit to the Messiah, the fatal imprisonment by which his public work was to be stopped was close at hand, and Jesus, descrying for His forerunner and Himself naught but martyrdom in the distance, was selecting disciples to whom might be entrusted the great and precious truths of which He was the bearer, and which could only be declared after His death. Seeing the final and fatal setting of the sun and moon of the Jewish horizon, God was calling out the stars that might light its firmament a little longer before the night of total darkness should settle down on it forever.

Having found by experience that the weak reasoning of the Pharisees and feeble discerning of the Sadducees, the uncertain teaching of the Scribes and the evil conduct of all, had tended to corrupt His "Father's House," the Messiah laid it down as the first rule of His kingdom that those who would enter it, must do so with the humility and faith of little children. John and Andrew, whom He met on that memorable day, when

they, following, walked home and abode with Him certain hours, He proposed to call formally, at another time, and James and Simon also, but the latter He set apart, by naming the moment He saw him. This reader of the face, as well as the heart of man, saw at a glance that Simon was of quick and powerful apprehension, capable of deep and strong convictions, honest also, and bold and impulsive; and hence prompt to speak his convictions with frankness and energy. He saw, too, that when persuaded of the true character of his Messiah, Simon would proclain it plainly and emphatically, without fear or favor, and therefore was the very man to take up, after His and John's departure, their united cry of "Repent" and "Believe," and sound it as the alarum of the new dispensation. But, being under law, the Messiah was a Son in His minority. Hence He ever consulted the will of His Father in heaven. It is not too much then to assume that with the quick communication between God and men called "prayer," He immediately asked, while intently regarding him, and instantly received the promise of this man as the one to whom should be revealed the highest nature of His Person. This being the case, it was just as instantly decreed that Simon Bar-Jona should be the first-born, in order to be the first confessor of the incarnate LORD. And, if so decreed, why should not the fiat be spoken at once?

It is true Simon was not yet "converted," though by birth and circumcision a member of the Jewish Church. Indeed as far as the knowledge of the promised Christ and His work was concerned, he was a very child. He had not even received the baptism of John, for, though the Scripture says John and Andrew were the Baptist's disciples, they nowhere intimate that Simon was such. Had he been, Andrew would scarcely have needed to bring him to Jesus with the words: "We have found the Messias." He, too, could have heard of Him from the Baptist. How then, not being a disciple of his, could he know from conviction, and for a certainty, that revelation which was the very purpose of John's baptism—Jesus as the

sinless Messiah and the Lamb of God? However, he was a true child of the ancient covenant, and an honest Jew who adhered strictly to the faith of his fathers. "I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean," he could doubtless say in a moral as well as literal sense, and therein was equal to St. Paul, who "as touching the law was blameless," and the young man who had "kept all the commandments of God from his youth up." Unlike that "generation of vipers," who, fleeing "from the wrath to come," applied to John for baptism without repentance and avowal of their guilt, he needed not the reform preached to these as a fit preparation for their spiritual amendment. He was righteous in his own eyes, it is true, but it was the self-righteousness of innocence and ignorance, not of deceit and hypocrisy. His conscience was clear of any outward transgression of the law. A good man, he could recognize a better when he saw him, and be strongly attracted by him. As he stood then for the first time before his Messiah, gazing with admiring eyes, and heart yearning toward Him, the latter, seeing that though honest and sincere he was profoundly ignorant of his state by nature, and sorely needed that baptism of awakening which was to convince of sin and teach of God, gave it to him, at once, in the words: "Thou art Simon the son of Jonas, thou shalt be called Cephas (a stone)."

"The Spirit of the Lord" coming strongly and suddenly on the Messiah, was not to be resisted, and Simon, caught in its embrace, was held without his knowledge or intention. "Jesus," the Scripture says, "baptized not, but His disciples." That is, He baptized not *visibly*. Of course not. What need had He of water, or the intervention of men! Had He not submitted to this ordinance officially, for the very purpose of being able to dispense with both, and baptize *invisibly?* Without question, His ministers are ordained for the visible rite, but there are countless numbers whom these can never reach. How then shall they obtain that which God has enjoined on every soul of man as absolutely necessary to his

salvation—re-birth through baptism? How, if not in this very way? Surely for those who in no wise neglecting nor rejecting, but who, longing for, cannot obtain it, Jesus received visible baptism; and also for the millions of heathen who never hear of Him in this life! Therefore, on the one hand, it dare not be said that such as have not received the outward ordinance are not saved. And on the other, it must be said that every one who is saved has been baptized, either visibly or invisibly, with the double baptism of Jesus, as He has made the two one in the declaration: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, '*of water and the Spirit*,' he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

Every act of the Redeemer was official as well as personal, and the first public act of His ministry was as important and necessary for man as any other. Not alone for Himself, but to obtain all the virtue of baptism for His people, had the sinless One gone down into the Jordan, and by the very act o asking for it, assumed, to the dismay of John, the character of a sinner, and seeker of light and knowledge, repentance and faith! John, recognizing him as holier than he, shrunk from implication and act, and "forbade Him," saying: "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" But when Jesus returned the significant words: "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," "he suffered Him." But though John demurred, the Father saw in this impulse and movement the first official act of Jesus, as the Saviour of men, robed in the sins of His people, and publicly approving by the "voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," He sent Him forth from the hands of the Baptist with a new name, "Christ," "the Son of God," and bearing the gifts of a new Name and a new Sonship, for the sole purpose of giving them to others.

What, then, was to hinder the Head of the Christian church, "mightier" than John, from bestowing on the visitor who loved Him at sight, of His own baptism of water, and that which would henceforth go with it—His life sinless and holy,

the revealing power of which would cause him, in time, to know himself and repent of his sins, and know the Christ and trust in Him as a Saviour—indeed, of giving him also (for they could not be separated) of His accompanying baptism of the Spirit, which, carrying likewise the life of the LORD incarnate, would enable him to recognize "the Christ" as "the Son of the living God," even though humiliated, or fettered and bound by the restraints and limitations of His mortal humanity! It is true the Christian church was not yet opened, nor Christian baptism ordained, and until now the two had not been united—John's and the Father's—"the water and the Spirit" having been, in the case of Jesus, separate. This was the first intimation of their union, and, in the person of Peter, peculiarly appropriate, since he was to announce it by formally opening the new church in the words: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." However, the Head of that church can do what none of His ministers can, or may do,—anticipate His own laws, and even set them aside; and this He will do, on extraordinary occasions, for like extraordinary purposes. And therefore, as "Jesus baptized not" visibly, in the simple but pregnant words: "Simon, son of Jonas, thou shalt be called Cephas," the first-born of the Christ was baptized invisibly by his King and Messiah, and called by Him, the Father of all who believe, with the new name of Cephas, a Stone, after His own Name of Christ, the Stone of Israel, including therein the higher name of Peter, a Rock, yet to be unfolded in all its significance.

"The Lord hath need of him," would be an all-sufficient answer, but it may be said that as John's "baptizing with water" was not only "unto repentance," but that Jesus "might be made manifest to Israel as their true and actual Messiah," so Jesus' baptizing of Peter with water and the Spirit was that the Messiah might be made manifest to him (who was to be the first of all the future new-born Israel) in

His wonderful Person of "the Christ" and "the Son of the living God;" but this, only in order that as such he might confess Him. This done, Peter was to go back and learn the full lesson in its regular order. At present, it was just so much knowledge in advance as would enable him to do that work of confessing, without which the visible Jewish church could not have been closed, nor the Christian opened.

"When the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask John, Who art thou? he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. Then said they unto him, Who art thou, that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, 'Make straight the way of the Lord,' as said the prophet Esaias." Only a "voice" he claimed to be, nothing more; not the great "Messenger of the Lord," whose birth and career an angel announced; and a voice, too, which John thought would die when he died, and never be heard again. The fearless tongue, that cost him his head, was indeed silenced by Herod, but his work was taken up by a greater than he, and lo! the Baptist is still preaching to men in the wilderness: "Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and his voice crying: "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!" "He must increase, but I must decrease," said the man of great humility, when told that "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than he," and "this my joy, therefore, is fulfilled." His humble baptism of water he supposed would be set aside by the Messiah's greater one of the Holy Ghost, but Jesus gave it immortality by making it the channel of His own, and John still goes before, baptizing with water unto repentance, while Christ accompanies, baptizing with the Spirit unto Life.

SECTION IX.

The Messiah's First Disciple.

The man whom John and Andrew had "found" to be "the Messias," was indeed the King of the Jews, and as such the humble fisherman in his simplicity called to see Him, and the noble Son of David, realizing his worth, would not let him depart from His presence empty-handed. With kingly grace he gave him three royal presents, the costly robes of repentance and faith, and a ring, in which was set a stone engraved with a new name, destined to become more and more brilliant and precious by use. The prophet of "Galilee" was indeed "that Prophet" whom Moses foretold God would raise up unto them, and over this man of loving and childlike spirit He threw a portion of His own prophetic apparel, in token that the largest part of it should fall on him when He ascended to heaven. The "gracious" preacher of Nazareth received and dismissed His visitor with a breath of His own inspiration as a pledge that he should shortly preach the Gospel with fervor and eloquence unsurpassed. And so, when the Jewish brothers walked away from the dwelling of their Messiah—the dwelling of their Messiah! He was the incarnate LORD, and though humbled, wherever He dwelt when on earth, there was the Christian church. And so, when they walked away, little did they know, while recalling the looks and tones and words of their King, "the Son of David," that the required "two or three" had met together in the sacred Presence and Name. Small thought had Andrew that while he was calmly looking on, the divinely-appointed teacher had enrolled his brother's name as the chief of the disciples; and far was either from dreaming, as they bade their Messiah farewell, that by His significant words Simon had been set apart as the first partaker of His Divine glory, and the sole sharer in the initial bitterness of His death. Nor did either imagine, that of the twelve living stones which

were to form the foundation of His House, Cephas, the unique, the peculiar, had been selected and approved, and was now to be fitted and tried and set.

And the Messiah? Though as a Saviour He was placed irrevocably under certain laws, yet the right to revoke some of these in favor of His people and cause had been reserved; and this could be done in regard to *visible* baptism, seeing that through the imparting of His life He is "of God made unto them" circumcision and baptism, as well as "wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption;" and thereby fully justifies His name of "WONDERFUL." Such being then His power and grace, it was most becoming to dispense with the outward application of water on His first twin-disciple, St. Peter; and afterward equally becoming to dispense with another law in the case of His second twin-disciple, St. John the Divine.

And the submissive "Son of man," who asked all things of "the Father?" Probably, while the retreating footsteps of the visitors died away in the distance, leaving Him to rejoice in the reward of obedience, He thanked His "Father, Lord of heaven and earth," that in this critical moment had been guided to His dwelling Andrew and Simon; and as the brothers, destined to become the sons of the true Jesse, innocently passed in review before Him whose eyes rested wistfully on the latter, God had further prompted His great Prophet, Priest and King with the words, "Arise, anoint him: for this is he."

VI.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE LIFE OF BISHOP MATTHEW SIMPSON, OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH. By George R. Crooks, D.D. Illustrated. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1890. Price $3.75.

This work is sold by subscription only. Messrs. Garretson & Co., publishers, No. 66 North Fourth Street, Philadelphia, are general agents for the work in Pennsylvania and adjacent States.

The name of the publishers is a sufficient guarantee that the work is prepared in the best style of the printer's art. It is printed in good, clear and sufficiently large type, on good paper and handsomely bound. The illustrations add much to the external merits of the work.

But it is, of course, the matter rather than the form that constitutes the merit and value of this work. The subject is a popular one. The life of such a man as Bishop Simpson is highly interesting, not only to a particular class, as the church to which he belonged, and of which he was an ornament, but to all who can appreciate a great and good character wherever found.

We have read this biography with the greatest interest. It goes far to show that a strong and great man is not, as a rule, the creature of circumstances, but a controller of them. If greatness is in him it will assert itself even in the face of untoward circumstances. Bishop Simpson's boyhood and youth were passed with but little outward help, in a new country, in poverty, and with few and scant educational advantages. He made himself master of the substance of a college course without the advantages of being a regular student and graduate of a college. And it appears that he looked not merely to the idea of utility, as might be expected in the case of one who had to make his own way in life, but he aimed at liberal culture for its own sake, in order to make a man of himself as above mere worldly good in the way of wealth and place.

I am glad, as I write this, to be able to quote the words of President Eliot, of Harvard University, in a speech delivered before the New York Chamber of Commerce on the 18th of November, 1890, in which he says:

"I should not worthily represent here the profession to which I belong if I did not say in closing, that *liberal education is an end in*

itself, apart from all its utilities and applications. When we teach a child to read, our primary aim is, not to enable it to decipher a way-bill or a receipt, but to kindle its imagination, enlarge its vision and open for it the avenues to all knowledge. The same is true of liberal education in its utmost reach. Its chief objects for the individual are development, inspiration and exaltation. The practical advantages which flow from it are incidental, not paramount."

Bishop Simpson did not overlook the humanities, but set to work at the study of Latin and Greek, and in the course of his life he occupied positions in which this culture became necessary to his success. It seems familiar to read of his first text-books, Historia Sacra, Græca Minora, Græca Majora and Mair's False Syntax—books that I studied in the Academy over forty years ago.

Like many other earnest men it was a difficult problem for him to determine his calling in life. He studied medicine, law and finally theology, and entered upon his chosen work, the ministry. One rule that he laid down to govern him in this, as in all other matters was, that he would not follow any path of merely his own selection, but seek to follow the indications of Providence, thus submitting his own will to the will of God.

There are two periods in his life in which Bishop Simpson stands out in all the glory of his full-developed and masterly qualities of mind and heart. In 1856 he was appointed, together with Dr. McClintock, to attend the Wesleyan Conference in England. Both during this visit and another in 1881, in attending the Œcumenical Conference in London, he made a deep impression upon the large audiences he addressed. Then during the late war his address in New York brought out that eloquence of which he was capable on great occasions. On the latter occasion he had the sympathies of his audience with him, but in speaking in England he had first to overcome the prejudices of the English, especially at that comparatively early period, against an American speaker. He also delivered an address in Berlin, Germany, in 1856, before the Evangelical Alliance, and in 1881 in Exeter Hall, on the tragic death of Garfield.

He was considered an indifferent, if not a rather poor, speaker in his early life, and this was one of the difficulties, as he thought, in the way of entering the ministry, but in after years he became one of the most effective pulpit orators this country has ever produced.

By diligent and persevering application he became a good scholar. He filled successfully the positions of professor and president in several colleges. He was editor of *The Western Christian Advocate* about the years 1848–51, when the great agitation on the subject of slavery called forth his pungent editorials. When at last the Civil War came, and when during its gloomiest period as men hearts

failed them, he stood firm and unshaken in his faith in Providence.

It is a pleasure, as well as an instruction, to read the life of such a man, especially during such a period in our nation's history. He rose above all partisan feeling in encouraging his countrymen to trust in the God of nations, who was leading this nation of the future through its trials and humiliations to its manifest destiny. There was here something more, something higher, than patriotism, great and good as this is; it was a firm, clear, Christian faith. Travelling from east to west, and again from west to east, he met and addressed great multitudes of people, and did much to inspire them with the same confidence and hope. He was an intimate and trusted friend of President Lincoln, as well as of Secretary Stanton, and many other public men at the head of the government. The President could rely upon his sound judgment as to the mind of the people in reference to the war, which he had so many opportunities of ascertaining in his extensive travels, and the President was always glad to meet with him and talk over public affairs.

Perhaps the leading traits or qualities in the character of Bishop Simpson were his entire unselfishness and his honesty. From his early years he seems to have shrunk from any position or course that offered to him merely personal advantages. He seemed to have an instinctive aversion to selfishness. He considered only what was the will of God and what was for the good of his fellow-men, and this grew to be the confirmed principle of his life. Such a man can be trusted. His judgment is never warped by personal consideration, he is free from prejudice.

In such a life there is much to instruct and edify. It shows that true success comes, not from self-seeking, but from a faithful devotion to duty, and to the great ends and purposes of life. Much has been written just upon this point: what constitutes success in life, and what will best secure success. Of course much depends upon what is meant by success, but if we mean by it the performance of that work, and the attainment of that end, for which our natural endowments are best adapted, then it is true that success is most surely reached by following the indications of Providence, and laboring for the good of our fellow-men, without regard to our own personal advantages. The Saviour lays down the only true principle: "He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life shall gain it."

There was a sweet childlike simplicity in Bishop Simpson in this respect. He did not seem to imagine that his own personal advantage was in consideration. He did not seem to ask at all whether a certain course would bring him gain or favor, but only whether it was the course God ordered him to pursue. And in the end he lived to see how surely this principle led him to success. That is to say: his own personal advantages were bound up in the

work he did for others. His own life came to a beautiful full development, so that he passed away as a sheaf of corn ripe to be gathered in the harvest.

The biographer, Dr. Crooks, has done his work well. There is one other biography with which we may compare it, the "Memoir of Norman Macleod, D.D., by the Rev. Donald Macleod." Dr. Macleod was, of course, a greater scholar than Bishop Simpson, and the Scotch humor and wit that appear in the Memoir are wanting in this life, but we have felt much the same interest in reading the one as in reading the other. It is no easy thing to write an interesting biography. What aided Dr. Crooks much in his work was the portions of autobiography left behind by Bishop Simpson. And this reference to the Memoir of Dr. Macleod calls to mind also another biography recently published in our own church, viz.: "The Life and Work of John Williamson Nevin, D.D., LL.D.," by Dr. Theodore Appel. Dr. Nevin differed much from both of the great men just mentioned. He was a man of ideas rather than of practical affairs, and yet the reading of his life makes the same impression, that one is communing with a great and good man. Such a life inspires others to seek after the same pure and unselfish principles in guiding and directing our own lives.

History consists in part of biography. Society is made up of individuals, and the general life is largely formed and governed by leading personalities. In the life of Macleod one learns much of the life of the church in Scotland, in the life of Bishop Simpson there is much of the history of Methodism in this country, and in the life of Dr. Nevin one finds much of the inner history of the Reformed Church.

We commend this life of Bishop Simpson as an interesting and profitable volume for any library, and to be placed in any family. Of course the life of Dr. Nevin comes nearest home to our Reformed people and our Reformed families, but there is abundant room for both in every family in our church. Perhaps if we had more of such literature it would take the place of much of a lighter kind, whose influence is questionable, especially where it is read to excess by the young. This biography keeps up the reader's interest from beginning to end, and that is one of the tests of its worth. It teaches us great lessons by example, the most forcible way of teaching moral truth.

MODERN CRITICISM CONSIDERED IN ITS RELATION TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL: Being the Bampton Lectures for 1890. By Henry William Watkins, M.A., D.D., sometimes scholar of Balliol College; Fellow of King's College, London; Archdeacon and Canon of Durham, and Professor of Hebrew in the University of Durham. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 31 West Twenty-third Street. 1890. Price, $5.00.

The preparation of this volume, we are told in a "prefatory note," had its origin in the author's asking the late Bishop Light-

foot "how he accounted for the fact of the frequent assertion that the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel was disproved by modern criticism, in the presence of the strong and accumulating evidence in its favor," and in the latter's suggesting to him that "the subject might be profitably treated in a course of Bampton Lectures." We are also further imformed, that shortly afterwards a rough outline of the arguments which presented themselves was drawn out by the author and forwarded to the Bishop, who entirely approved of the proposed treatment, and was instrumental in having him appointed to deliver the lectures of 1890.

The subject of the volume, it may not be amiss here to state, is not the Fourth Gospel, nor yet the evidence external or internal in favor of its authenticity and genuineness, but, as implied in the title of the book, the bearing of modern criticism on the Fourth Gospel. Its especial purpose is to estimate this criticism, and to show that there is no foundation for the frequent assertions that modern criticism is fatal to the claims of this Gospel.

The lectures of which the volume consists are eight in number. None of these is complete in itself, but each is an important step in the stairs by which the conclusion is finally reached that "there has been an accumulating mass of evidence in favor of the genuineness of the writing which we are justified in calling, without trace of uncertainty in our voice, 'The Gospel according to St. John.'." In the first three lectures of the series the evidence of the first eighteen Christian centuries is very carefully and elaborately presented. In the four following lectures, the results of the various schools of criticism of the present century are very ably and thoroughly considered. The closing lecture presents the conclusions reached in the preceding lectures and treats in a general way of the scope and character of the Gospel and its significance for our own age. All the lectures give evidence of thorough scholarship and superior intellectual attainments on the part of their author. In spirit they are fair and honorable; in style, clear and forcible; and in contents, rich in the material necessary for forming a correct judgment concerning the important questions that have been raised with regard to the Gospel under consideration in them. The work is a truly valuable contribution to our Theological Literature.

THE LIVING CHRIST AND THE FOUR GOSPELS. By R. W. Dale, D.D., Birmingham. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, $1.50.

Why is it that those who believe in Christ continue to believe, notwithstanding the formidable assaults which in our own time have been made upon the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures? and, Do the Four Gospels contain that representation of our Lord, that account of His miracles and teaching, which was given by the men who knew Him, and who, after His death, preached the

Christian Faith? These are the questions which are considered in this volume. That they are discussed in a scholarly manner, and with marked ability, the name of the author is a sufficient guarantee. Of modern writers on theological subjects, there is none, indeed, that we read with more pleasure and satisfaction.

The volume itself consists of fourteen lectures which Dr. Dale delivered to the Carrs Lane (Congregational) Church, Birmingham, of which he is the honored pastor. It is accordingly of a popular character and admirably suited to meet the wants of intelligent readers generally.

The first four lectures are devoted to the question, Why do those who believe, continue to believe? The answer given to this question is, "that they do so because whatever may have been the original grounds of their faith; their faith has been verified in their own personal experience;" and, furthermore, because "the representation of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Four Gospels appeals, and appeals immediately to all those elements and powers of life that give answer to manifestations of the presence of God." In other words "they believe in Christ because they see God in Him." The proofs of this answer are ably presented, and the objections to it fully met. In the nine following lectures the evidence in favor of the historical trustworthiness of the story contained in the Four Gospels is clearly set forth. The concluding lecture is a review of the argument contained in the preceding lectures.

The work is, in every respect, a masterly one, and well calculated to deepen faith in the living Christ, and to increase confidence in the trustworthiness of the Gospel history. Dr. Dale's argument for the verity of our Christian faith we, indeed, believe to be irrefutable. It fully meets the doubts occasioned by destructive criticism.

A. M. MACKAY, Pioneer Missionary of the Church Missionary Society to Uganda. By his Sister. With portrait and map. Author's Edition, New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890. Price, $1.50.

This book is a sister's memorial to a heroic brother. Mackay, of Uganda, who is the subject of it, was the son of Alexander Mackay, L.L.D., a minister of the Free Church of Scotland, and was boen in the little village of Rhynie, County of Aberdeen, Oct. 13, 1849. When he was eighteen years of age his father moved to Edinburg, and here he entered the Free Church Training College for Teachers, and later the University of Edinburg. At the age of twenty-four he left Scotland for Germany, where in Berlin he pursued his studies for several years more. He then offered his services to the Church Missionary Society, and in the Spring of 1876 he was sent as a pioneer missionary to Uganda, in Africa, where he labored successfully until his death, which occurred Feb. 8, 1890. Though his life was a comparatively brief one, yet he

lived long enough to prove himself one of Christ's true noblemen and heroes. In the preparation of this memorial his sister has made extensive and very skillful use of his letters and journals. The volume before us accordingly gives a great deal of interesting information concerning the scene of his labors, as well as a living portraiture of his self-denying character. It is therefore a doubly interesting and inspiring book—one of the very best of missionary biographies. On this account it ought to find a place in every church and Sunday-school library.

THE SERMON BIBLE. Matthew i–xxi. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1890. Price, $1.50.

The general features of this volume are the same as those of the preceding volumes on the Old Testament which have already been noticed in this REVIEW. Under every text is given an outline of an important sermon by some eminent preacher, and in many cases several such outlines are presented. There are also full references to theological treatises, commentaries, etc., where any help is given to the elucidation of the text. If properly used the work cannot fail to be of great service in the way of stimulating thought and thus aiding in the preparation of sermons. We know of no other work of the kind that possesses so many excellent qualities.

A GOOD START. A Book for Young Men. By J. Thain Davidson, D.D., Author of "Talks with Young Men," etc., etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890. Price, $1.25.

A good start in life is not only desirable but highly important. A right start, however, alone is a really good start. The aim of the present volume is to instruct young men how to make such a start. The truths presented in it are truths which all young men should seriously consider. They are, moreover, presented in a most interesting and impressive manner. Among the subjects considered are, "Something Better than Riches," "The Lover of Pleasure," "Is the Young Man Safe?" "The City's Wilderness," "Men of Pluck," "Betting and Gambling," "The True Test of Religion," "Strong in the Grace of Christ," and, "A Perfect Man." Parents will do well to place the book into the hands of their sons. They will also find it a delightful and instructive book to read themselves.

LIFE IN CHRIST AND FOR CHRIST. By the Rev. Handley C. G. Moule, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Author of "Thoughts on Christian Sanctity," "Outlines of Christian Doctrine," "Veni Creator," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890. Price, 40 cents.

The vital relations subsisting between our Lord Jesus Christ and His believing people are the theme of the six chapters which make up this little volume of one hundred and thirty-two pages. In the

first four chapters the subject is considered in its two-fold aspect of Life in Christ and Christ in Life. The two remaining chapters treat of Christ, respectively, as, "The Bright and Morning Star," and "The Lord both of the Dead and Living." The book throughout is devotional and edifying. It will be found an admirable help to holy living.

THE CREDENTIALS OF THE GOSPEL; A Statement of the Reason of the Christian Hope: Being the Nineteenth Fernly Lecture. Delivered in Carver Street Chapel, Sheffield, on Monday Evening, August 5, 1889. By Joseph Agar Beet. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1890. Price, $1.00.

In this volume Prof. Beet aims to prove the truth of the Gospel. The arguments which he adduces in its favor are not specially new, but they are admirably marshaled to do effective work. The Lecture which makes up the body of the work is divided into eight sections. Of these, section first is introductory. Sections second and third treat, respectively, of the evidence within, and of the evidence in the material world. In section fourth Christianity is compared with other religious, and its superiority is clearly demonstrated. Section fifth is devoted to a consideration of Christ and the Christian document, and section sixth to a forcible presentation of the historical argument in their favor. In section seventh objections are answered, and in the concluding section the results of the discussion are summed up and their practical bearing pointed out. A number of valuable notes of considerable length are appended to the Lecture. These notes relate to the following subjects: The Origin of the Moral Sense, Freedom or Necessity, Scientific Agnosticism, The Bible and Science, and Biblical Rationalism. The work is one of decided merit and cannot be read without profit. Its scholarship is marked; its style, clear, forcible and eloquent. In the "Expositor" for August, 1890, Prof. Marcus Dods says of this work: "There is much that is freshly thought and admirably put throughout the book; and however well read in apologetic literature any one is, he will find much to interest and much to convince in the chapters which deal with the resurrection and the miraculous. At this point Prof. Beet makes a distinct advance in the argument, and deserves the thanks of all who are interested in the defence of Christianity."

PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. Eight Lectures Delivered before the Ohio Wesleyan University on the Merrick Foundation. By Randolph S. Foster. Third Series. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1890. Price, $1.00.

The purpose of these lectures is to consider and explain the principal facts of Christian experience. First the limitations of the subject are stated and the terms carefully defined which are used

in the title of the volume. Then the following subjects are discussed in a clear and forcible manner in the order in which they are here given, namely, Implications and Conditioning Grounds of Experience, Antecedent History and Principles which color Experience, Process and Experience as regards Forgiveness and Regeneration, Facts which Condition Experience Subsequent to Regeneration, Some Phases of Experience, and Possibilities of Grace and Advices. It is scarcely necessary to say that all these subjects are considered from the Arminian stand-point. Though we cannot accept as correct some of the views advanced, yet we can heartily recommend this volume by Bishop Foster as a highly interesting and instructive treatise. The subject with which it has to do is, in our opinion, a very important and fruitful one, and deserves to be far more thoroughly considered by theologians generally than it has yet been. Its complete study according to the inductive method we are convinced would do much to advance and unify the theology of the Christian Church.

ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES. A Guide to the Study of the Sunday-school Lessons for 1891. Including Original and Selected Expositions, Plans of Instruction, Illustrative Anecdotes, Practical Applications, Archæological Notes, Library References, Maps, Pictures, Diagrams. By Jesse L. Hurlbut, D.D., and Robert R. Doherty, Ph.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1890. Price, $1.25.

The general character of this volume is well described in the contents of the title page. Of the many helps prepared as guides to the study of the Sunday-school lessons for the present year, this is one of the very best that has come under our notice. The teacher who acquaints himself thoroughly with its varied contents can scarcely fail to impart interesting and edifying instruction. We would yet add that the work is gotten up in excellent style and contains nearly four hundred pages of valuable reading matter and illustrations.

SUPREMACY OF LAW. "The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the Soul." By John P. Newman, D.D., LL.D., a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1890. Price, $1.00.

This is a timely and highly attractive little volume. In it Bishop Newman discourses in a very interesting and instructive manner about the author, promulgation, and mission of law; of the law of reverence, of rest, and of home; of the rights of life, of property, and of fame; and of the law of purity. All that he says on these important subjects is deserving of careful consideration. In these days of license men need to be reminded of the supremacy of law and of the importance of obedience to its just demands. The book is one which should find a place in every family and Sunday-school library.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By Rev. Elbert S. Todd, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1890. Price, 75 cents.

We have in this small volume not a condensed history of modern missions, nor yet a general discussion of missionary work, as might be inferred from its title, but merely a brief treatise on some phases of this many-sided theme which seem to have been neglected. The subjects to which attention is directed in its pages are as follows: "The Conversion of our Anglo-Saxon Ancestors," "The Missionary Triumphs of Paganism," "Christianity an Oriental Religion," "Characteristics of Ethnic Religions," "The Solidarity of Humanity," "War and the Progress of Christianity," "Commerce and Christianity," "The Humanitarian View," "Statesmanship and Missions," "Methods," and "Success." All these subjects are treated in an able and instructive manner. An effort is made in the treatise to suggest some of the most obvious lessons which the experience of the past furnishes concerning the question of methods of carrying forward the missionary work.

BY CANOE AND DOG-TRAIN AMONG THE CREE AND SALTEAUX INDIANS. By Egerton Ryerson Young (Missionary). With an Introduction by Mark Guy Pearse. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1890. Price, $1.25.

This book gives an account of missionary labors among the Indians in the Northwest Territories north of Lake Winnipeg. It is written in a plain yet attractive style, and abounds in interesting incidents. The simple facts which it presents can scarcely fail to awaken a deep interest in missionary work among the Indians, and on this account it ought to have a wide circulation. It is a shame that up to this time so much money has been spent to subjugate and destroy the red man, and so little been given to Christianize and save him.

ESCHATOLOGY; or, the Doctrine of the Last Things, According to the Chronology and Symbolism of the Apocalypse. By F. G. Hibbard, D.D., Author of the "Psalms Chronologically Arranged with Historical Introductions," "The History and Geography of Palestine," "The Commentary on the Book of Psalms," etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1890. Price, $1.25.

Dr. Hibbard not only believes that Eschatology is a legitimate and indispensable branch of theology, but, also, that it must supply the true gauge and moral value of all doctrines relating to moral government and redemption. He furthermore holds that all its particular subjects are purely matters of written revelation, leaving nothing to mere speculation, and that, therefore, all our knowledge of them is, and must be, purely exegetical. In the volume before us he consequently treats of these things according to what he con-

ceives to be the chronology and symbolism of the Apocalypse. The subjects which chiefly claim his attention are the following, to wit: The downfall of Anti-Christ, the millennium, the second coming of Christ, the intermediate state, the resurrection, the new creation, and the restitution of all things. His discussion of all these topics is scholarly and highly suggestive, but we are not prepared to accept his conclusions on all points. A satisfactory exposition of the Book of Revelation is still a desideratum.